

BR  
1  
C559  
v. 11  
No. 2  
Pt. 1

# CHURCH HISTORY

PART 1



*Published by*  
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN  
GENERAL LIBRARY

# THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFTE, 1855; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT OF  
THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

## OFFICERS FOR 1942

E. R. HARDY, JR.	President
HAROLD S. BENNER	Vice President
THOMAS C. PEARCE, JR.	Secretary
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS	Treasurer
SIMPLY E. MEAD	Assistant Secretary

## OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

JOHN THOMAS McNEIL	ROLAND H. BAINTON
WILHELM PAUCK	F. W. BUCKLER
HERBERT WALLACE SCHWEIDT	PERCY V. NORWOOD
REUBEN E. R. HARKNESS	CYRIL C. RICHARDSON
CHARLES H. LEVY	KENNETH S. LATOURETTE

## EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*  
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS  
E. R. HARDY, JR., *ex officio*

PUBLICATION OFFICE, BERNI, INDIANA

EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Church History is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price is three dollars per year. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. To foreign countries, the postage of twenty-five cents a year should be added. Subscriptions should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Ave., Chicago, or to Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, 89 Claremont Ave., New York, N. Y. Remittances should be made to the order of American Society of Church History.

All communications regarding contributions, book reviews, and all other matters of editorial nature should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Claims for missing numbers and changes of address should be addressed to Prof. R. H. Nichols, 89 Claremont Ave., New York, N. Y.

Entered as second class matter March 9, 1934, at the post office at Berni, Ind., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

BR  
C559  
v. 11  
no. 2  
pt. 1

# CHURCH HISTORY

## EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS

E. R. HARDY, JR., *ex officio*

---

Vol. XI

June, 1942

No. 2

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### PART 1

- A HISTORY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN PARTY FROM  
PRIDE'S PURGE TO THE DISSOLUTION OF THE  
LONG PARLIAMENT

*Leland H. Carlson*

83

- PRINTING AND THE GROWTH OF A PROTESTANT MOVE-  
MENT IN GERMANY FROM 1517 TO 1524

*Louise W. Holborn*

123

- SOME PROTESTANT ATTITUDES ON THE LABOR QUES-  
TION IN 1886

*Carl Warren Griffiths*

138

## CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEWS:	149
SCOTT, ERNEST F., <i>The Nature of the Early Church</i> ..... Ernest W. Parsons	
MILLER, HUGH, <i>Christian Truth in History</i> ..... E. R. Hardy, Jr.	
PETRY, RAY C., <i>Francis of Assisi, Apostle of Poverty</i> ..... Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.	
HULL, WILLIAM I., <i>Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam</i> ..... Albert Hyma	
SMITH, C. HENRY, <i>The Story of the Mennonites</i> , Robert Friedmann	
BAKER, GEORGE CLAUDE, JR., <i>An Introduction to the History of Early New England Methodism</i> ..... A. W. Nagler	
WILLIAMS, DANIEL DAY, <i>The Andover Liberals</i> .... Sidney E. Mead	
ACOMB, EVELYN M., <i>The French Laic Laws (1879-1889)</i> , ..... F. W. Buckler	
DE MILLE, GEORGE E., <i>The Catholic Movement in the American Episcopal Church</i> ..... William Wilson Manross	
MUIR, GLADDYS ESTHER, <i>Settlement of the Brethren on the Pacific Slope</i> ..... Clifford M. Drury	
NEF, JOHN U., <i>The United States and Civilization</i> ..... Robert Hastings Nichols	

## PART 2

List of Members of the American Society of Church History as of June 1, 1942	163
--	-----



## A HISTORY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN PARTY FROM PRIDE'S PURGE TO THE DISSOLUTION OF THE LONG PARLIAMENT

LELAND H. CARLSON

*Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois*

The period of the Civil Wars and the Commonwealth marked a turning point in the development of the English people. With the insight that comes from historical perspective, we can see that the Glorious Revolution of 1688-1689, the accession of a new dynasty in 1714, the American Revolution of 1776, and even the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo in 1815, were to a considerable degree influenced by the significant events of the period 1640-1660.

One of the most significant events occurring during this period was the alteration made in the structure of the English church. Religious matters were of primary importance in 1640. During the first three days of the meeting of the Long Parliament, its members organized a committee of religion. The speeches delivered during the first two months of the Long Parliament were replete with religious grievances and suggested reforms. And during the next two years, 1641-1642, Parliament enacted a series of drastic measures which shook the ecclesiastical structure more violently than had the changes of Henry VIII or Edward VI. The Court of High Commission was abolished, bishops were excluded from their seats in the House of Lords, and finally Episcopacy itself was demolished, together with its *Book of Common Prayer*, its *Psalter*, and its *Thirty-nine Articles*.

The religious measures enacted by Parliament up to 1643 indicate that if the religious reform had continued without any outside influence, a modified, curtailed Episcopacy or an Erastian Presbyterianism would have been the result. But in 1643 the combined influence of the Westminster Assembly, Scotch military aid, and the Solemn League and Covenant committed England to a Presbyterianism more rigid than the Erastian party desired. Parliament was willing to pay the price of

religious alteration when confronted with political necessities and powerful opposition.

The years 1643-1648 constitute the period when Presbyterianism was established as the legal religion of England. After five years of work the Westminster Assembly of Divines formulated the *Directory for Worship*, supplanting the *Book of Common Prayer*, the *Confession of Faith*, replacing the *Thirty-nine Articles*, the *Form of Church Government*, establishing the Presbyterian system in place of Episcopacy, and a *Larger* and a *Shorter Catechism* for instruction.

At the very height of Presbyterian success in the Westminster Assembly, however, the Presbyterian party in the House of Commons began to weaken. The refusal of the Presbyterian Parliament to pay the arrears due the army changed the army grievances into political demands. During 1647-1648 the army and the Independents combined effectively to curb the Presbyterians. The invasion of the Scots in 1648 failed miserably, and therefore the hope of military aid for the English Presbyterians was frustrated. Thereupon the Presbyterians began negotiations with the King as the only method of checking the army and settling the country according to the Presbyterian plan. The army retaliated by excluding all those willing to close with the King—Pride's Purge—and assumed control of the government.

The purpose of this article is to trace the fortunes of the Presbyterians from their downfall in 1648-1649 to the dissolution of the Rump Parliament in April, 1653. The story includes an account of their public agitations against the Cromwellian régime (Sections I, II, III), their secret negotiations (Sections IV, V), and their final submission to the government (Section V).

## I.

### *Defiance of the Government in the Presbyterian Pulpit*

By February, 1649, Presbyterianism as a parliamentary power was destroyed. The House of Commons had been purged, the House of Lords abolished, and King Charles I executed. In London the Presbyterian aldermen and councilmen had been supplanted by officials subservient to the army,

and the troops of General Fairfax patrolled the City. Those Presbyterian leaders who were most inimical to the army either had fled the country or were languishing in prison, and many other less significant men had been cowed into a sullen silence.

Despite these party misfortunes, one group within the Presbyterian ranks remained intact. Because of their calling and their learning, the clerical Presbyterians of London wielded a strong influence over the minds of men. And this power was not limited to spiritual matters. Not infrequently in their preaching, the ministers entered the realm of political discussion. To the government official such action was ecclesiastical trespassing, but to the clergymen it represented a love of God manifested in a love for man, a vertical relationship applied horizontally. Like Antigone of old, moreover, the ministers were prone to identify personal opinion with the commandment of God. Consequently, there was truth in the assertion of a contemporary critic of the cloth that, though the clergy claimed to speak by the Spirit from above, the source of their bleatings and lowings was no higher than an upper room in Sion College [a Presbyterian rendezvous].<sup>1</sup> And a hostile editor, observing this process of rationalizing religious conviction, wrote:

There are so many Presbyterian jugglings in private, such murmurings abroad, and so many mutinies in the pulpit; such well-acted incantations for the glory of the Kirk, and the loss of their Diana, that every prayer is a stratagem, most sermons mere plots against the State and upon their hearers.<sup>2</sup>

Among the Presbyterian ministers of London, some of the most vehement were Thomas Case, Thomas Cawton, James Cranford, Stanley Gower, William Jenkins, Christopher Love, and William Taylor. These men had been intensely irritated by the *coup d'état* of 1648, and were not slow to manifest their exasperation in the pulpit. To them the army was a generation of vipers, heretics, schismatics, oppressors, men whose lives were not worth a prayer, and whose deaths were not worth a tear. Both the army and the Rump Parliament, they

<sup>1</sup> John Price, *Clerico-Classicum, or The Clergy Alarum to a Third War* (London, 1648), 48.

<sup>2</sup> Marchamont Nedham, *The Case of the Commonwealth of England Stated* (London, [1650]), 63.

asserted, were guilty of sedition, bloodshed, rebellion, and murder. After hearing some of these condemnations, an ironical Independent observed that this type of opinionated expression, spoken with such "admirable honesty" and "unparalleled frankness," never appeared in Peter, James, or John—not even in Jesus Christ!<sup>3</sup> And a member of the Council of State, sensitive to the changes in public opinion, wrote in his diary: "The angry Presbyterians spit fire out of their pulpits and endeavored to blow up the people against the Parliament."<sup>4</sup>

During the two months preceding the execution of the King, the Rump Parliament had sought unsuccessfully to curb the antagonistic pulpit demonstrations of the clergy. Not only had it failed, however, to stop the mouths of the ministers in their own churches, but it had been publicly rebuked in one of its own gatherings by a Presbyterian clergyman. On December 27, 1648, just three weeks after Pride's Purge, Thomas Brooks and Thomas Watson had preached at the monthly parliamentary fast service. Three days later the House had voted to send the customary thanks to Mr. Brooks, the Independent minister, for his great pains in preaching and had given him permission to print his sermon, but neither courtesy had been extended to Mr. Watson, the Presbyterian pastor, inasmuch as he had been guilty of "not acknowledging them to be a Parliament."<sup>5</sup> The House naturally had been piqued and in its future selection of clergymen took care to invite only those preachers who were friendly to the new régime. The result was that down to 1653, during the life of the Rump Parliament, the Presbyterians were deprived of any opportunity to speak at public celebrations and governmental functions.<sup>6</sup>

3 Price, *Clerico-Classicum*, 7.

4 Lucy Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, ed. C. H. Firth (rev. ed.; London, 1885), II, 155 f.

5 John Rushworth, *Historical Collections* (London, 1721-1722), VII, 1378. Great Britain, *Journals of the House of Commons* (London, 1803-[1885]), VI, 107. Cited hereafter as *C. J.*

6 In the five years after 1648 the Independent clergymen monopolized the appointments to preach before the assembled Parliamentary members in St. Margaret's, Westminster. Denis Bond, William Bridge, Joseph Caryl, Thomas Goodwin, William Greenhill, Philip Nye, John Owen, Hugh Peters, Peter Sterry, and William Strong were frequently invited to speak. Stephen Marshall, who had forsaken the Presbyterian ranks, preached before the Parliament on November 1, 1649. But well-known Presbyterians were not included on the appointment lists (*C. J.*, VI, 251, 287, 301, 318, 374, 423, 447, 480, 491, 549).

The defiance by the clergy was galling, not to say dangerous, to the new government, and the Council of State discussed possible restrictive measures. In the month following the execution of Charles I, a clear-cut issue presented itself when Thomas Cawton, Presbyterian minister at St. Bartholomew's, publicly prayed for Charles II in a sermon preached before the Lord Mayor and aldermen at Mercer's Chapel on February 25, 1649. The Council of State took decisive action. On the following day it appointed a committee of six to investigate the incident, and on February 28 summoned Cawton by the Council messenger. On March 1 and 2 Cawton was examined by Sir Henry Mildmay and Sir William Masham, and on March 3 the Mayor was ordered to give testimony. The Council decided to report the case to Parliament and to commit Cawton to the Gatehouse prison without privilege of bail.<sup>7</sup> On March 6 Parliament resolved to make an example of Cawton by trying him for violating the Act for Prohibiting the Proclaiming of any Person to be King of England, or Ireland, or the Dominions thereof.<sup>8</sup> Defying the government, Cawton refused to recall his supplication and remained in prison.<sup>9</sup>

Because of the general attitude of the clergy, and particularly because of Cawton's prayer, Parliament on March 28 appointed a committee of five to bring in legislation forbidding ministerial meddling with matters of state and governmental transactions.<sup>10</sup> While this committee was deliberating the best measures to be enacted, another instance of flouting the new republic was brought to the attention of the Council. Thomas Case, Presbyterian minister at St. Mary Magdalen, was accused in June of having publicly prayed for Charles II, but the issue seems to have been dropped for lack of witnesses who would testify to the offense.<sup>11</sup> The incident did, however, have the effect of spurring on the parliamentary committee, and on July 9, 1649, the House of Commons passed three resolutions which (1) condemned preaching and praying against Parliament and its proceedings, (2) forbade sermons and

<sup>7</sup> Great Britain, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1649-1650*, I, ed. Mary A. E. Green (London, 1875), 19-27. Cited hereafter as *Cal. St. Pap., Dom. Ser.*

<sup>8</sup> *C. J.*, VI, 157.

<sup>9</sup> Thomas Cawton, Jr., *The Life and Death of That Holy and Reverend Man of God, Mr. Thomas Cawton* (London, 1662), *passim*; *C. J.*, VI, 278.

<sup>10</sup> *C. J.*, VI, 175.

<sup>11</sup> *A Book Without a Title* (London, 1649), 7.



supplications for Charles Stuart or James Stuart, (3) and compelled the due observation of days of thanksgiving and humiliation, together with the reading and publishing of Acts, Orders, and Declarations of Parliament. All infractions were to be referred to the Committee of Parliament for Plundered Ministers.<sup>12</sup>

The new legislation had the desired effect. For the next seven months the clergymen were careful not to incur such punishment as had been meted out to Cawton, although the activities of one Presbyterian minister, Stanley Gower, came under the scrutiny of the government officials. On March 4, 1650, the Council of State notified two of its agents, Colonel James Heane and John Browne, to ascertain the truth of reports concerning him: "Having been informed that Stanley Gower has lately, both in preaching and praying, endeavoured to stir up the people against the present Government, but not having received particulars, we desire you to examine witnesses as to his deportment, and certify us, and if you see cause, secure him."<sup>13</sup> Evidently the investigators saw no cause, since Gower was not secured, but the investigation itself must have been sufficiently intimidating to prevent any repetition of the suspected offense.

Of the three resolutions passed by Parliament on July 9, 1649, the one concerning thanksgiving days was most exasperating to the Presbyterians. Although some of them perfunctorily observed the letter of the law, they manifestly violated its spirit. Others refused to celebrate the fasts ordered by the government and observed their own fast days.<sup>14</sup> One of the staunch Presbyterians, William Jenkins, described as a "sententious elegant preacher" by Baxter, ignored the parliamentary day of thanksgiving for the abolition of the mon-

12 *C. J.*, VI, 257. Very likely it was this legislation which the Scottish ministers had in mind when they accused Cromwell of persecuting the English clergy. To this charge Cromwell replied: "The ministers of England are supported, and have liberty to preach the gospel, though not to rail, nor under pretense thereof to over-top the civil power, or debase it as they please. No man hath been troubled in England or Ireland for preaching the gospel; nor has any minister been molested in Scotland since the coming of the Army hither" (*Several Letters and Passages between His Excellency, the Lord General Cromwell and the Governor of Edinburgh Castle and the Ministers There* [London, 1650], 4 f.).

13 *Cal. St. Pap., Dom. Ser.*, 1650, II, 24, 214.

14 Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae: or, Mr. Richard Baxter's Narrative of the Most Memorable Passages of His Life and Times*, ed. Matthew Sylvester (London, 1696), 66.



archy. Haled before the Committee for Plundered Ministers on June 27, 1650, he created such a disturbance that the committee complained to the Council of State.<sup>15</sup> Jenkins was deprived of his benefice at Christ Church and banished from London.<sup>16</sup>

Observation of the fast days commemorating a success of the fleet or a defeat of the Irish rebels was not so distasteful, but Cromwell's triumph over the Scots at Dunbar on September 3, 1650, put the inflexible Presbyterians in an embarrassing predicament. On September 17, 1650, Parliament resolved that October 8, 1650, should be observed as a public thanksgiving for Cromwell's victory.<sup>17</sup> Knowing that Cromwell's triumph was distasteful to the Presbyterians sympathetic with their Scotch brethren, Parliament commanded the Lord Mayor to enforce the law strictly, and to give a speedy account of any non-observance of October 8.<sup>18</sup> On October 17 Parliament referred to the Council of State such information as it possessed concerning dangerous and refractory ministers,<sup>19</sup> but once more the matter was quietly allowed to drop.<sup>20</sup>

15 C. J., VI, 436 f. *Cal. St. Pap., Dom. Ser. 1650*, II, 231.

16 Great Britain, Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Thirteenth Report*, Appendix, Part I, *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, Preserved at Welbeck Abbey* (London, 1893), I, 587. He was ordered to keep at least twenty miles from London.

17 C. J., VI, 468.

18 *Ibid.*, 485.

19 *Ibid.*, 485.

20 The Council of State had to act circumspectly. A flagrant violation, such as Cawton's prayer for Charles II, was considered treason and could be punished, but the non-observance of a thanksgiving day was an offense not easy to judge. Loyalty and sympathy were virtues difficult to evoke by punitive measures. The Council knew that the ministers had a strong popular following. It knew also that the clergy could and did "observe" the parliamentary order in some fashion—though what a fashion! Moreover, the government, which theoretically stood for toleration, was sensitive about the accusation of violating tender consciences.

If the Presbyterians could not rejoice in Cromwell's success at Dunbar, much less could they observe the "crowning mercy" manifested to the Parliamentary forces in their victory over the Scots at Worcester on September 3, 1651. But the correct way to celebrate such a deliverance from the "northern presbytery" was demonstrated by the Independent clergyman, Peter Sterry, while preaching before the Parliament on its thanksgiving day, November 5, 1651. Utilizing the occasion to denounce those who opposed the providences of God, Sterry particularly stigmatized the Presbyterians with coarse comparisons: "I have desired in my preaching, in my Prayers, to work with God even for the opening of the eyes of men to see, that the same Spirit which lay in the polluted bed of Papacy may meet them in the perfumed Bed of Presbytery, that the fornications and sorceries of this Whore, are then greatest when they are most mysterious." (Peter Sterry, *England's Deliverance from the Northern Presbytery Compared with Its Deliverance from the Roman Papacy* [London, 1652], Dedicatory Epistle.)

Despite the offenses of such men as Cawton and Jenkins, we must not assume that all the Presbyterian clergymen were engaged solely in preaching sedition, denouncing the Parliament, or praying for Charles II. The more energetic and vociferous ministers, such as Cawton, Gower, Case, and Jenkins, made themselves heard on political issues. But many of the ministers, perhaps fifty of the eighty Presbyterian clergymen of London,<sup>21</sup> were more guarded, and confined themselves primarily to the task of preaching the gospel and ministering to their parishioners. What was said of one of their own leading colleagues, Edmund Calamy, *viz.*, that during the Interregnum "he kept himself as private as he could," might be applied to many others. Probably some, despairing of any immediate alteration in government, agreed with Milton when he wrote:

Yet much remains

To conquer still; peace hath her victories  
No less renowned than war, new foes arise  
Threatening to bind our souls with secular chains:  
Help us to save free conscience from the paw  
Of hireling wolves whose gospel is their maw.<sup>22</sup>

## II.

### *Pamphlet Warfare with the Commonwealth Government*

Although the spoken word, especially that heard from the pulpit, had considerable weight during the Cromwellian régime, the printed word was constantly gaining in power and was becoming an effective medium for influencing men's minds. During the sixteenth century the press had been closely regulated by the government through the instrumentality of the bishops, but despite the watchful eye of the censors, unlicensed pamphlets, such as the Marprelate tracts, had been sporadically issued. In the seventeenth century the pamphlet became more influential as a means of expressing public sentiment. Archbishop Laud made a determined effort to curb unlicensed opinions, and cruelly punished such men as John Bastwick, Henry Burton, Alexander Leighton, and John Lilburne for

21 An estimate based on the names of offending ministers, listed principally in the *C. J.* and the *Cal. St. Pap., Dom. Ser.*

22 *The Oxford Book of Seventeenth Century Verse*, eds. H. J. C. Grierson and G. Bullough (Oxford, 1934), 504. Of course, the Presbyterians would make their own identification of the "new foes" and the "hireling wolves."

their infractions. When the Long Parliament convened in 1640, these proto-martyrs of the freedom of the press became heroes, and Laud was sent to prison. After 1640 the restrictions were virtually removed, and during the eventful two decades of the Civil Wars and Commonwealth the presses produced such a flood of broadsides, papers, pamphlets, and books that George Thomason, the London bookseller, was able to amass a collection of 22,255 items.<sup>23</sup>

The Presbyterians, who were making such an effectual use of the pulpit, were not slow to utilize the pamphlet medium against the new régime. On January 20, 1649, they had issued their *Serious and Faithful Representation*, condemning the government for its purging of the House of Commons and for its proceedings against Charles I in the High Court of Justice. The pamphlet had also contained a vehement denunciation of the army for its illegal occupation of the City of London and for its subversion of the laws of the kingdom.<sup>24</sup> A week later, on January 27, a second pamphlet, a *Vindication*,<sup>25</sup> had been issued because of the charges made against the Presbyterians, particularly the clergy, in the army publication, the *Agreement of the People*.

The aforementioned pamphlets constituted the targets at which numerous writers aimed their verbal shafts in the months that followed the execution of the King. This was true particularly of the *Serious and Faithful Representation*, which, in addition to its main protest against the trial of Charles I, had included an explanation of the refusal of the Presbyterians to attend an army conference on the subject of religion.<sup>26</sup>

The replies to these Presbyterian manifestoes were not slow in appearing. In February, 1649, a tract appeared bearing the title, *An Answer to the Cities Representation*. Its anonymous author professed himself to be a Presbyterian patriot but contended in an Independent manner. The gist

<sup>23</sup> British Museum, *Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts Relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and Restoration, Collected by George Thomason*, ed. G. K. Fortescue (London, 1908), I, xxi. These tracts constitute one of the best collections of source material for the period.

<sup>24</sup> *passim*.

<sup>25</sup> Issued just three days before the beheading of Charles I.

<sup>26</sup> This conference pertained especially to the topic of toleration. The reasons advanced by the Presbyterians for their non-attendance were given in order to meet strong criticism of their action.

of his *Answer* was that all sin and error could not be attributed to the army, and that the former Presbyterian Parliament and the City of London were the underlying causes of what had occurred. The writer advised his readers to allow events to take their course inasmuch as that which was of men would come to naught, and that which was of God could not be overthrown.<sup>27</sup> Such a Gamalielian philosophy of history could be comforting only to a few.

Another critic, a self-appointed physician to heal the wounds of the nation, prepared *An Eye Salve to Anoint the Eyes of the Ministers of the Province of London*. Unfortunately, this ointment aggravated more than it alleviated. The writer set forth seventeen rhetorical questions wherein he accused the Presbyterians of having acted in former times against their monarch, and even of having taken up weapons against the King. Their sudden conversion, he asserted, was due not to any sincere change of heart but to a fear that their Dagon—tithes and offerings—would be pulled down by the army and Parliament.<sup>28</sup>

The ablest reply to the *Representation*, however, was written by John Price, a citizen of London. In his pamphlet, *Clerico-Classicum, or the Clergy Alarum to a Third War*, Price denounced the boldness and effrontery of the Presbyterian clergy who sought to be ministers of state rather than ministers of the gospel. Instead of seeking to bring peace to a distracted nation, they were acting as incendiaries. Price accused the ministers also of padding the list of subscribers to the *Representation*, and singled out one of the signers, Christopher Love, as a well-known fomenter of revolt. All in all, Price concluded, it was regrettable that the Presbyterians were seeking to defeat the will of God, particularly when it was so manifest that God was using the army to work out his great purposes for the people of England.<sup>29</sup>

After having read these last three pamphlets, all of which exalted the part played by the army, an anonymous Presbyterian writer issued *The Armies Remembrancer*. He sought

27 *An Answer to the Cities Representation* (London, 1648), *passim*. The writer is using the argument advanced in Acts 5:38-39.

28 *An Eye Salve to Anoint the Eyes of the Ministers of the Province of London* (London, 1649), 4 f.

29 John Price, *Clerico-Classicum, or the Clergy Alarum to a Third War* (London, 1649), 14 f., 56 f.

therein to refresh the memory of his readers by compiling a catalogue of the sins committed by the military leaders and stressed particularly the late action of purging the Parliament. Using the *a fortiori* argument, the author stated that the King's attempt to arrest five members in January, 1642, was a trivial offense compared with the outrage of excluding more than one hundred legislators from the House of Commons in December, 1648.<sup>30</sup>

In March appeared an able and militant pamphlet entitled, *The City Ministers Unmasked*. Its author perceived that a standard charge of the Presbyterians against the government was that the army's assumption of power was a rank usurpation of lawful authority, a subversion of the laws of the kingdom, and a transgression of the divine law. Cutting his way through hackneyed expressions and time-honored phrases, the writer proposed the pertinent question of what lawful authority really was. If change was permissible in ecclesiastical government, was it not likewise allowable in political affairs? Had not the Presbyterians been responsible, at least partially, for the upsetting of monarchical authority in 1642 and 1643? If so, then why should the political pendulum stop at any particular point?

Even more perturbing were some of the implications of the author's argument. Who constituted the godly party? Who were the real malignants? On what basis could each type be determined? Such difficult questions were more easily asked than impartially answered. And they penetrated beneath the mere verbiage of personal arguments and ideological differences. Who was to decide whether Pride's Purge was the exclusion of a few evildoers by a multitude of honest men, or the carrying away to Babylon of a multitude of upright men by a few nefarious individuals? The answer to that question in 1649 depended on the political and religious ends sought by men and on the best techniques for their attainment.<sup>31</sup> A Presbyterian dialectic, which could prove that Parliament had been

<sup>30</sup> *The Armies Remembrancer* (London, 1649), 31 f.

<sup>31</sup> *The City Ministers Unmasked* (London, 1649), 9 *et passim*. Both sides appealed to the *salus populi* as the *lex suprema*. But neither side clarified what that *salus populi* actually was; the assumption of both parties seemed to be that *salus* meant deliverance from the other party and that *populus* meant that group of people sympathizing with the respective party viewpoint.

destroyed, also could prove by the permutations of army logic that the same Parliament had been perfected.

In the same month of March, when the Presbyterians were seeking to frighten the government, only to be embarrassingly unmasked by an Independent, a certain Rapha Harford assigned himself the thankless task of mediating between the contestants in their pamphlet warfare. In his treatise, *A Gospel Engine, or Streams of Love and Pity to Prevent New Flames in England*, Harford sought to quench the fires of controversy. Presbyterians and Independents alike should realize, he warned, that spiritual values were incompatible with the hatreds and captious arguments of men. Let all parties reconcile their differences and begin practicing the Christian virtues. Above all, let wrangling men desist from their obstructionist efforts. To these latter individuals especially, Harford addressed his exhortation:

Oh that the Lord would persuade you to lay aside these dangerous and most ungrateful ways; dangerous, seeing they tend to nothing but judgment, fire, and sword, which you threaten and also strive to bring; ungrateful, seeing that those who have been working in the very fire to quench and keep it from your houses and all that's yours have done so with little of your help.<sup>32</sup>

Then, changing his figure of speech, Harford urged that those who would not help build the new walls of the kingdom at least would not play the part of Sanballat by hindering others from building.<sup>33</sup>

As the pamphlet warfare progressed, the government, faced with the problem of controlling public opinion, sought some means of checking "treasonable" and "scandalous" pamphlets.<sup>34</sup> Its policy of seizing unlicensed pamphlets, however, even had it proved successful, was only a partial solution, inasmuch as undesirable books continued to appear with the official *imprimatur* of the *censor librorum*. One of the censors to whom the Presbyterian writers naturally turned was James Cranford, minister at Christopher's and himself a staunch Presbyterian. John Price, the Independent, when

<sup>32</sup> Rapha Harford, *A Gospel Engine, or Streams of Love and Pity to Prevent New Flames in England* (London, 1649), 4.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 7. The story of building the new walls of Jerusalem is given in Nehemiah 4.

<sup>34</sup> As early as January 5, 1649, Parliament had issued an Ordinance directing General Fairfax to seize all unlicensed presses and to make diligent search for scandalous pamphlets (*A Warrant of the Lord General Fairfax to the Marshal General of the Army* [London, 1649], 3, 5).



condemning the *Serious and Faithful Representation* and the *Vindication of the Ministers in and about London*, aptly described Cranford as "that bountiful and liberal *imprimatur*—donor to any lying, scurrilous and scandalous pamphlet against the Parliament and army."<sup>35</sup> In addition to the aforesaid pamphlets, Cranford had licensed such objectionable publications as John Gauden's *The Religious and Loyal Protestation*,<sup>36</sup> John Gere's *Katadunamis: Might Overcoming Right*,<sup>37</sup> and *The Essex Watchmen's Watchword*.<sup>38</sup> To curb this evil, the government, on March 16, 1649, revoked Cranford's right to license books.<sup>39</sup>

One of the men against whom John Price had specially railed was Christopher Love. It was natural, therefore, that the latter bristled when he read Price's *Clerico-Classicum*. In his own reply, *A Modest Vindication of the Late Vindication of the Ministers of London from the Scandalous Aspersions of John Price in a Pamphlet Entitled Clerico-Classicum*, which appeared in April, 1649, and which was far from modest, Love sought to vindicate himself<sup>40</sup> and to defend the clergy for their maneuverings during the Civil Wars and their late proceedings on behalf of the King. In addition Love analyzed, paragraph by paragraph, the arguments of Price and scoffed at them whenever possible. On one point Love was clearly victorious. Price had accused the Presbyterians of padding the list of subscribers to the *Representation*, but Love was able to prove that with one possible exception the signatures were *bona fide* and that the objections of Price were sheer cavils.<sup>41</sup>

35 Price, *Clerico-Classicum*, 4.

36 That is, objectionable because Presbyterian.

37 Strongly anti-army in tone.

38 Probably written by several authors, this pamphlet was subscribed by sixty-three ministers.

39 Great Britain, *Journals of the House of Commons* (London, 1803-1885), VI, 166. In July, 1649, a book was published, entitled, *The Confession of Faith, and Catechisms Agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster: together with Their Humble Advice Concerning Church Government and Ordination of Ministers*, which carried the *imprimatur* of James Cranford. Since any publication of the Westminster Assembly of Divines required the official approval of Parliament, the House of Commons directed the Committee for Plundered Ministers to ascertain if and when Cranford had licensed the book, and if he was not culpable, to determine what person, if any, had given permission to the printer, Robert Bostock (*C. J.*, VI, 275).

40 Although the pamphlet appeared anonymously and was written in the third person, the authorship of Love was obvious.

41 [Christopher Love], *A Modest Vindication of the Late Vindication of the Pamphlet Entitled Clerico-Classicum* (London, 1649), 19-20.

Love's treatise, in turn, provoked a reply from one J. L., who wrote an *Illumination to Sion College*. The author essayed to conclude the pamphlet warfare by his *magnum opus*, but failed miserably. Professing to answer the *Serious and Faithful Representation* and the *Vindication* of the Presbyterians, as well as Love's *A Modest Vindication*, the writer merely restated in a prolix style the story of Pride's Purge, the downfall of the Presbyterians, and the execution of Charles I. Its only conclusion was the easy recommendation that the ministers should attend more to matters of the gospel and less to affairs of state.<sup>42</sup>

About the same time that J. L. entered into the conflict waged between Price and Love, another licenser incurred the wrath of the Commonwealth officials. Gilbert Mabbott, a friend to the Presbyterians but an enemy to the Independents, was summoned before the Council of State on May 7, 1649, and examined for licensing pamphlets which were hostile to the government.<sup>43</sup> On the same day the Council decided to recommend Mabbott's discharge to Parliament, and on May 22 the House of Commons deprived him of any further right to license books.<sup>44</sup>

Two further Presbyterian manifestoes were written against the Commonwealth during the summer months of 1649. Early in June there appeared the *Logoi Apologetikoi; Four Apological Tracts*, written by one T. B. His treatise was more a denunciation of the government than an apology for the Presbyterians. By adducing a series of quotations from Scripture and ancient authors, T. B. attempted to prove that the republican leaders, in beheading Charles I, had perpetrated an act which violated Scriptural injunctions and contradicted the established precedents of classical times.<sup>45</sup>

In September, 1649, a biased and hostile summary of the activities of the Independent government was published under the title of *Anarchia Anglicana, or the History of Independency*. Some of its passages were so vitriolic against the leaders that these men must have smarted intensely as they read of themselves and their party. When the author discussed the treat-

42 *An Illumination to Sion College* (London, 1649), 32.

43 Great Britain, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1649-1650*, ed. Mary A. E. Green (London, 1875), I, 127.

44 *C. J.*, VI, 214.

45 T. B., *Logoi Apologetikoi; Four Apological Tracts* (London, 1649), *passim*.

ment of the King by the Independents, he listed the names of the regicides in red ink to emphasize the bloodiness of the deed. In every way possible he sought to discredit the motives of the ruling officials and prove their conduct ignominious. Although the pamphlet carried the pseudonym Theodorus Verax, Parliament was in no way impressed by the veracity of Theodore and ordered the Council of State to ascertain the author, printer, and publisher of the scandalous work.<sup>46</sup>

Books such as Walker's *Anarchia Anglicana* incited the members of the House of Commons. On September 20, 1649, Parliament enacted an important piece of legislation, An Act Against Unlicensed and Scandalous Books and Pamphlets, and for Better Regulating of Printing.<sup>47</sup> This enactment represented an attempt by the Commons to prescribe, once and for all, comprehensive and stringent regulations against printing "treasonable" and "scandalous" books. Heavy fines and penalties were set up as a deterrent to infractions. After the passing of the Act of September 20, the Council of State issued special orders enjoining the mayor, aldermen, and councilmen to execute the law without respect of persons. The Council requested the City Corporation to caution particularly the Justices of the Peace, on whom the burden of enforcement devolved. Furthermore, beginning on October 9, 1649, and continuing for the next three weeks, the Council, in pursuance of this Act, compelled forty-one printers to enter into recognizances with two sureties of £300 each.<sup>48</sup>

The efforts of the Council and Parliament in September and October to curb unlicensed publications, and the imprisonment of Clement Walker in November, served to deter the Presbyterians thereafter from condemning the government too freely by means of the press. In 1650, as if to conclude the verbal battle, an anonymous individual delivered his

46 C. J., VI, 312. By November 13, as a result of diligent investigation by the Council, Clement Walker was apprehended, and Parliament ordered him committed to the Tower (*Ibid.*, 322). Walker was one of the members who had been excluded from the House of Commons by Colonel Pride and kept in prison thereafter for several weeks. It is difficult to classify him religiously, since he professed to be a member of no party, but if we accept Richard Baxter's negative definition of a Presbyterian as one who was not an Episcopalian, an Independent, or a sectary, then Walker may be termed a nominal Presbyterian with Erastian tendencies.

47 Great Britain, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660* eds. C. R. Firth and R. S. Rait (London, 1911), II, 245-54.

48 *Cal. St. Pap., Dom. Ser., 1649-1650*, I, 522-24.

*One Blow More at Babylon.* Written by an Independent who professed to be a friend to the army and the Parliament, this pamphlet was cast in the form of a dialogue between two travellers from the west, of the City of Excester [sic], and the discussion centered on the reasons for the Presbyterian opposition to Parliament and the Independents. With pretentious erudition the speakers adduced Scripture and apostolic history to prove Independency. The conversation and the journey happily terminated after the travellers had concluded that although the stiff-necked Presbyterians refused to co-operate with the Independents, yet God in his Providence was evidencing his approval of the latter.

As a whole, this polemic was a fair criticism of the "hotter spirits" among the Presbyterians but an unfair analysis of Presbyterianism in general. The engagement in words was merely a clever display of arguments whereby the Presbyterian was easily outpointed and finally, at least in the conception of the author, thoroughly vanquished. To the Presbyterians, *One Blow More at Babylon* was pure sophistry.

### III.

#### *Condemnation of the Policy of Toleration*

When Parliament, on August 29, 1648, had legislated the "Form of Church Government to be Used in the Church of England," the Presbyterian Church had been confirmed in its position as the one established ecclesiastical system of England.<sup>49</sup> The newly enacted law with one exception supported the teaching that Presbyterianism was "an ordinance of God, which hath power and authority from Christ to call the ministers and elders, or any in their bounds, before them to account for any offense in life or doctrine, to try and examine the cause, to admonish and rebuke, and if they be obstinate, to declare them as ethnics and publicans, and give them over to the punishment of the magistrates; also, doctrinally, to declare the mind of God in all questions of religion."<sup>50</sup> The one exception pertained to the coercive power of the magistrate in ecclesiastical offenses. The Presbyterian tribunals—the

49 Great Britain, *Journals of the House of Lords* (London, n. d.), X, 461.

50 Robert Baillie, *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 1637-1662*, ed. David Laing for the Bannatyne Club (Edinburgh, 1841-1842), II, 147.

local classis, the district presbytery, the provincial synod, and the national assembly—could examine, admonish, and rebuke, but beyond this stage they could not go. As the Scots had feared, the new establishment was a “lame Erastian Presbytery,” with Parliament as the final court of appeal. Herein was a fundamental difference between the English Presbyterian Church and its Scottish prototype, for the latter not only enjoyed ecclesiastical independence from state interference, but even exercised considerable influence upon governmental affairs.

Since Presbyterianism, however weakened, had become the legally established state religion of England, it was natural that Presbyterians opposed any compromise with ideas and practices of sectaries. There was but one God and John Presbyter was his prophet. There was but one Bible and John Calvin was its rightful exegete. His great theological compendium, the *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, outlined clearly and logically the way, the truth, and the life for seekers after righteousness. Any deviation from it would surely lead to confusion and error.

Confirmed thus by the law of the land, and convinced by Calvinistic doctrine, which had been preached for almost a century to English Congregations, the Presbyterians of England could not understand why men advocated latitude in the realm of religious belief and forms of worship. There was only one road to the new Jerusalem, and men ought not to leave it to wander on circuitous by-paths. Of course, rigid Presbyterians were certain that they were travelling on the straitened way leading unto life. This conviction precluded any admission that they might be following the same devious paths along which the prelates had proceeded. Nor would they accept any comparison of the new presbyter with the old priest. Such a mistaken analogy, they believed, did not proceed from a truth-loving mind but from a soul impervious to the light. Any assertion, they maintained, that the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy had been merely supplanted by an equally odious *jus divinum* of Presbytery must emanate from a biased individual who was more the enemy of all religion than the opponent of Presbyterianism *per se*.

In the light of these beliefs, it is not difficult to under-

stand the attitude of Presbyterians toward the policy of religious toleration initiated by the new government. Admittedly, apostates such as Antinomians, Arians, Socinians, agnostics, and atheists would accord liberty of conscience to sectaries, but true men of God would not be renegade in their duty toward the erring brethren. Therefore, when the government of a Christian nation justified its policy of toleration by pleading that tender consciences must be preserved inviolate, the Presbyterians concluded that such an argument must be a subtle snare of Satan himself. As one Presbyterian suggested, the foulest actions "always borrow fair pretenses." If the Devil had not transformed himself into an Angel of Light, would anyone have been seduced by him?<sup>51</sup>

Religious freedom, as conceived by the modern man, is the elixir of life. But, as understood by the seventeenth century Presbyterian, toleration was not a spiritual compound of understanding and patience. Rather, it was a mixture of the worst characteristics in men's nature, with no commendable virtues whatsoever to neutralize the evil elements. This conception of toleration as a dangerous concoction of the worst possible ingredients is seen in a declaration formulated by a group of ministers, who warned their readers of the perils inherent in any policy of religious latitudinarianism:

A Toleration would be the putting of a sword into a madman's hand; a cup of poison into the hand of a child; a letting loose of madmen with firebrands in their hands; an appointing a city of refuge in men's consciences for the devils to fly to; a laying of the stumbling-block before the blind; a proclaiming of liberty to the wolves to come into Christ's flock to prey upon his lambs.<sup>52</sup>

51 John Gere, *Katadunamis: Might Overcoming Right* (London, 1649), 1.

52 *The Harmonious Consent of the Ministers within the County Palatine of Lancaster with Their Brethren the Ministers of the Province of London, in Their Late Testimony to the Truth of Jesus Christ and to Our Solemn League and Covenant; as also of the Errors, Heresies, and Blasphemies of Those Times and the Toleration of Them* (London, 1648). Quoted from A. H. Drysdale, *History of the Presbyterians in England; Their Rise, Decline, and Revival* (London, 1889), 352 n.

This statement should be compared with the idealistic declaration made by Robert Baillie, who was reputed to be as strait-laced as any among the rigid Scotch Presbyterians: "But if once the government of Christ [Presbyterianism] were set up among us, we know not what would impede it, by the sword of God alone without any secular violence, to banish out of the land those spirits of error, in all meekness, humility, and love, by the force of truth convincing and satisfying the minds of the seduced. Episcopal courts were never fitted for the reclaiming of minds. Their prisons, their fines, their



The attitude of the Commonwealth government in the matter of toleration differed from that of the Presbyterians not so much in kind as in degree. Both believed that the government should repress positive religious error. But whereas the Presbyterians contended for an ecclesiastical monopoly, the Cromwellian régime advocated at least a limited toleration for sectaries. Although both parties were theoretically agreed that no liberty should be given to papists and prelatists, the government in practice was reluctant to enforce the letter of the law. Consequently, the religious policy of Parliament was held in suspicion by the Presbyterians, who, placing the worst construction upon every ambiguous act, were prone to see a concerted campaign among the Independents to subvert true religion and surrender the country to the iniquitous papists.

Because of these differences in viewpoints on the subject of toleration, it was inevitable that the Presbyterians should resent any latitude afforded to dissenters by the Independents. Only one week had elapsed after the army had purged the House of Commons when the Presbyterians clashed with the military junta on the issue of toleration. The General Council of the army had invited several Presbyterians to appear before it and discuss the question of coercion in religious matters,<sup>53</sup> but they refused to attend the conference. When the army thereupon charged the Presbyterians with unwillingness to co-operate in settling the religious problems of the kingdom, the latter replied with a public declaration, which they published on January 20, 1649, as *The Serious and Faithful Representation*.<sup>54</sup> The reasons ascribed by the Presbyterians for their non-attendance at the army deliberations were that their presence would be tantamount to countenancing the proposals proffered by the military cabal and that the army did not wish to hear any suggestions from the Presbyterians,

pillories, their nose-slittings, ear-droppings, and cheek-burnings did not hold down the flame, to break out in season with the greater rage. But the reformed Presbytery doth proceed in a spiritual method eminently fitted for the gaining of hearts; they go on with the offending party with all respect; they deal with him in all gentleness from weeks to months, from months sometimes to years, before they come near to any censure" (Robert Baillie, *Dissuasive from the Errors of the Times* [London, 1645], 7).

53 William Clarke, *The Clarke Papers*, ed. C. H. Firth ("Camden Society: New Series," Vol. LIV; London, 1891-1901), II, 71-132. See also A. S. P. Woodhouse, *Puritanism and Liberty* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons 1938), 32 f.

54 The twofold purpose of this pamphlet was to protest against the trial of Charles I, and to answer the charges of the army.

but merely desired concurrence in what had already been decided by a few army officers.<sup>55</sup>

On January 20, 1649, the very day on which the *Serious and Faithful Representation* was published, the army presented to Parliament a petition accompanied by the *Leveler Agreement of the People*.<sup>56</sup> This *Agreement* frankly advocated freedom in religious matters. Religious instruction was encouraged, although with the qualifying phrase, "so it be not compulsive." Men were to be won to the Christian life "by sound doctrine and the example of good conversation," but not by coercive methods. Those dissenting from the public form of doctrine, worship, and discipline were permitted to profess their faith according to the leading of their own consciences, and all existing penal laws concerning religion were to be repealed.<sup>57</sup>

On January 27, 1649, just one week after the army had presented its *Agreement* to Parliament, the Presbyterians published *A Vindication of the Ministers of the Gospel in and about London, from the Unjust Aspersions Cast upon Their Former Actings for the Parliament, with a Short Exhortation to the People to Keep Close to Their Covenant Engagement*. Probably penned by Cornelius Burges, an influential London divine, this pamphlet vigorously defended the Presbyterian position and even more vigorously condemned the army viewpoint. Cautioning the people to beware of ensnaring words, the writer further warned the laity of the dangers of heresy and blasphemy, and particularly exhorted them not to be misled by the subtle catchword of toleration.<sup>58</sup>

In January of 1649, a Presbyterian layman, William Ashurst, set forth his *Reasons Against Agreement*. Perturbed by the idea of freedom projected in the army *Agreement*,

55 *A Serious and Faithful Representation of the Judgments of Ministers of the Gospel within the Province of London* (London, 1649), pp. 1-3. Cf. [Christopher Love], *A Modest and Clear Vindication of the Serious Representation and Late Vindication of the Ministers of London* (London, 1649), 10 f.

56 William Cobbett, *Parliamentary History of England* (London, 1806-1820), III, 1261 f., 1267-77.

57 *Ibid.*, p. 1276. In order to make it appear that concessions were not being made to Catholics and Episcopalians, the army Council included the elastic clause: "It is not intended to be hereby provided that this liberty shall necessarily extend to popery or prelacy" (*Ibid.*, 1276).

58 *A Vindication of the Ministers of the Gospel in and about London, from the Unjust Aspersions Cast upon Their Former Actings for the Parliament, with a Short Exhortation to the People to Keep Close to Their Covenant Engagement* (London, 1648), *passim*.

Ashurst stressed the argument that when the people were left free to choose any religion, they were likewise free to reject all forms of religion. Any policy of toleration which encouraged papists and atheists obviously must have originated among diabolical Jesuits, abetted most likely by some of the wicked prelatical counselors of Charles I.<sup>59</sup> The only conceivable outcome, prophesied Ashurst, was universal license.<sup>60</sup>

The publications of the Presbyterians provoked two replies in February, 1649. One anonymous writer drew *A Parallel between the Ministerial Ingenuity of the Forty-Seven Ministers*<sup>61</sup> and the *Foul Miscarriages of the Army, in Their Declarations and Covenants-Breaking*. The author, who may have been a member of the General Council of the army, berated the Presbyterians for their refusal to participate in the December conference treating with the subject of coercion in religious practices.<sup>62</sup> Evidently they were interested only in preserving themselves and their tithes, and cared nothing for the welfare of those who disliked the sacerdotalism of the new ecclesiastical establishment. Such a spirit was sheer insolence and religious pride. Having thus censured the Presbyterians personally, the writer sought to refute their oft-asserted contention that they were bound by the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643. Disregarding legal commitments and written subscriptions made in previous years, the author bluntly stated:

There is no covenant which ought to be given or taken to compel in matters of religion any man to submit to such a form of worship as the State or any number of men appointed by them shall set up, though pretended to be according to the Word of God . . . I have showed such covenants are not to be taken or given that are destructive to the being of men and contrary to an express command of God.<sup>63</sup>

The second reply came from a London citizen, William Hartley. In his pamphlet<sup>64</sup> he accused the Presbyterians,

59 William Ashurst, *Reasons Against Agreement with a Late Printed Paper, Intituled, Foundations of Freedom: or, The Agreement of the People* (London, 1648), 28.

60 *Ibid.*, 12.

61 There were forty-seven ministers who subscribed *The Serious and Faithful Representation*.

62 *A Parallel Between the Ministerial Ingenuity of the Forty-Seven London Ministers and the Foul Miscarriages of the Army, in Their Declarations and Covenants-Breaking* (London, 1649), 4.

63 *Ibid.*, 38.

64 *The Priests' Patent Cancelled, or, the Layman's Answer to the Priests' Objections* (London, 1649).

particularly the clergy, of using their influence to mislead the people by subtle insinuations. They were guilty of bending "the people's hearts to the crooked bow of their self-concernments."<sup>65</sup> When he had hurled this shaft, Hartley proceeded to attack the Presbyterians for their intolerance in preventing men from being ordained if they did not fulfill man-made requirements. True ordination, Hartley opined, did not proceed from a university, a letter patent, or the hand of men, but came from God himself, who evidenced his selection of ministers by the graces and abilities revealed in men's lives.<sup>66</sup>

In the same month that these two writers were denouncing the intolerance of the Presbyterians, the clergy in the adjacent county of Essex came to the aid of their London brethren. The Essex divines were perturbed by the army proposals in the *Agreement* and feared that this pamphlet would be circulated in Essex for subscriptions. They were particularly apprehensive of the little phrase, "so it be not compulsive," which revealed the true intent of the army. Any recommendations with such an insidious proviso, they thought, would lead to a general loosening of all ecclesiastical restrictions. Consequently, sixty-three ministers published on February 15, 1649, *The Essex Watchmen's Watchword*, particularly addressed to the "religious and well-affected, the nobility, gentry, yeomanry, and others." The pamphlet contained a warning to its readers that the granting of toleration would be a reinauguration of prelacy, Arianism, Socinianism, and popery with its hateful mass and equipage. With impassioned words the writer exhorted the people:

Then let us in the bowels of Jesus Christ beseech you, as you tender your present and eternal good, and the good of your dear posterities,

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 1 f.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 9. Hartley's opinion on ordination and on the proper criterion for the selection of ministerial candidates should be contrasted, however, with the comments made by John Gauden in 1659, after observing for ten years the new process of selecting men for the ministry: "Grave and godly bishops, with their learned presbyters, must be set aside as broken vessels, that they may set up, by popular and plebian suffrages, some miserable mechanics, some engines, some pitiful praters and parasites of the vulgar, who have had no higher breeding or degree in Church or State than that of poor tradesmen . . .; their shop hath been their school, their hammers or shuttles or needles have been their books. At last, coachmen, footmen, ostlers, and grooms despair not to become preachers, by a rare and sudden metamorphosis, coming from the office of rubbing horses' heels to take care of men's souls" (*Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspiria. The Tears, Sighs, Complaints, and Prayers of the Church of England* [London, 1659], 165).

yea, in his name we require and charge you, as you would not be found guilty of all the errors, idolatry, blasphemy, wickedness, irreligion, that by this floodgate, if once opened, will break in upon this nation,—have nothing to do with this sinful ensnaring *Agreement*, avoid it, fly from it, as from the surest, if not only, engine Satan hath now left him for the demolishing of the beauty, yea, being of religion, and the advancing of popery, error, blasphemy, and whatever may make us an abhorring to God, a hissing to men, and an execration to all the churches of Jesus Christ.<sup>67</sup>

During the spring and summer of 1649, the Presbyterians remained inflexible in their attitude toward the religious policy of the government.<sup>68</sup> Since the position of the new régime was not too secure, the leaders of the republic could not safely defy public opinion. The sects had proclaimed Charles II as their king, difficulties with the Irish were increasing, and dissent among Englishmen was rife. In this condition of affairs the ruling officials adopted toward the Presbyterians a more conciliatory attitude in the summer of 1649 than they had manifested during the months immediately following Pride's Purge. In June, an observer noted that the government was beginning to "tickle the throats" of the Presbyterians by offering to continue the system of tithes,<sup>69</sup> and he suggested that Cromwell was thinking of liberating the five Presbyterian leaders imprisoned at Windsor Castle.<sup>70</sup> On August 14, 1649, Parliament released Thomas Cawton, who had been in prison for more than five months because of his public prayer for Charles II.<sup>71</sup>

We have seen that during the first eight months of 1649 the Presbyterians had continued to teach and write that the toleration of sects was tantamount to condoning irreligion and causing the flood-waters of atheism to engulf the land. In order to answer these charges, and further to conciliate the

67 *The Essex Watchmen's Watchword to the Inhabitants of the Said County* (London, 1648), 11 f.

68 In May, 1649, a Presbyterian writer, one T. B., published his *Logoi Apologetikoi: Four Apologicall Tracts* (London, 1649), wherein he denounced the army position and vindicated the attitude of his own party. There is nothing significantly new in his writing so far as the subject of toleration is concerned.

69 *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, May 29 to June 5, 1649.

70 Richard Browne, John Clotworthy, Lionel Copley, William Lewis, and William Waller. The suggestion that the prisoners might secure their liberty proved to be chimerical (Clement Walker, *Anarchia Anglicana*, Part II [London, 1661], 157).

71 Great Britain, *Journals of the House of Commons* (London, 1803-[1885]), VI, 278.

Presbyterians, Parliament on September 28, 1649, approved a public declaration,<sup>72</sup> and published the same on October 3 with the title, *A Declaration of the Parliament of England in Vindication of Their Proceedings, and Discovering the Dangerous Practices of Several Interests against the Present Government and Peace of the Commonwealth*.<sup>73</sup> This pamphlet, which was more apologetic than polemic in tenor, identified Parliament as one with the religious desires of the godly people of England, and sought to justify the policy of the government. Defending the Rump Parliament against the charge of indifference to true religion, the apologist of the government wrote as follows:

And because we are not ignorant how injuriously our Proceedings herein are charged upon us, as if we were setting up and countenancing an universal Toleration, when our true aim in the liberty we give is only the necessary encouragement we conceive due to all that are lovers of God and the Purity and Power of Religion, we can and do therefore declare, in the sight of God and man, that by whomsoever we shall find this liberty abused, we shall be most ready to testify our displeasure and abhorrence thereof, by a strict and effectual proceeding against such offenders. And if, after all this, any of those amongst us, that do profess a love to God, and zeal to advance Religion in its Purity, to be their chiefest end and desire, shall nevertheless sit still at a distance from us, or shall be given up so far by God, as to make defection to the contrary party against us, and join themselves to them that are open enemies to Religion and the Power of Godliness, in what dress soever they cover themselves, we shall not doubt but their own unfaithfulness, detestable neutrality, and wicked doings, will find them out.<sup>74</sup>

The spirit of conciliation manifested by the government seemed to have some effect, for in the following month of November, the Presbyterians published a subdued and moderate *Vindication of the Presbyterial Government and Ministry*. Although the writer denounced toleration as a sin, he revealed a more comprehensive spirit and he sought to open the way for a suitable compromise. Time and circumstances had brought changes which revealed themselves in the words of the Presbyterian apologist:

We abhor an over rigid urging of uniformity in circumstantial things,

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 300.

<sup>73</sup> The *Declaration* is printed in full in Cobbett, *Parliamentary History of England*, III, 1319-1334.

<sup>74</sup> *A Declaration of the Parliament of England in Vindication of Their Proceedings, and Discovering the Dangerous Practices of Several Interests against the Present Government and Peace of the Commonwealth*, in Cobbett, *Parliamentary History of England*.



and are far from the cruelty of the giant who laid upon a bed all he took, and those who were too long he cut them even with his bed, and such as were too short he stretched out to the length of it. God hath not made all men of a length or height. Men's parts, gifts, graces, differ; and if there should be no forbearance in matters of inferior alloy, all the world would be perpetually quarrelling. If you would fully know our judgments herein, we will present them in these two propositions: 1. That it is the duty of all Christians to study to enjoy the ordinances of Christ in unity and uniformity as far as it is possible . . . 2. That it is their duty to hold communion together as one Church in what they agree, and in this way of union mutually to tolerate and bear with one another in lesser differences. . . . For our parts we do here manifest our willingness (as we have already said) to accommodate with you, according to the Word, in a way of union, and (such of us as are ministers) to preach up and to practice a mutual forbearance and toleration of all things that may consist with the fundamentals of religion, with the power of godliness, and with that peace which Christ hath established in His Church. But to make ruptures in the body of Christ, and to divide Church from Church, and to set up Church against Church, and to gat her Churches out of true Churches, and because we differ in some things to hold Church Communion in nothing, this we think hath no warrant out of the Word of God, and will introduce all manner of confusion in Churches and families, and not only disturb but in a little time destroy the power of godliness, purity of religion, and peace of Christians.<sup>75</sup>

During the year 1649 the Presbyterians were able to advance a number of arguments against toleration, some of which seem to us today to be sensible and valid, others foolish and fallacious. But there was one underlying reason, however, why the Presbyterians opposed toleration; a reason never specifically stated by them, although their opponents insinuated as much, *viz.*, the fear that if toleration became too general, the Presbyterians would be displaced from their established position and left on the same level with the sectaries. In seeking to justify their ecclesiastical monopoly, the Presbyterians found it difficult to refute the argument that if prelacy could be changed to Presbytery, why could not the latter be changed to Independency?

On the confused issue of toleration, the pertinent question—who was the judge of what others should believe—was never squarely faced. Then, as now, the *de facto* answer of those in power was that they would determine correct belief;

<sup>75</sup> *Vindication of the Presbyterian Government and Ministry* (London, 1649), *passim*, quoted from Drysdale, *History of the Presbyterians*, 353 f.

of those who were persecuted that *de jure* each should determine by his own conscience.<sup>76</sup>

Facing this problem, and observing the troubled conditions in the Church because of the new freedom, Richard Baxter, the beloved minister at Kidderminster, Worcestershire, hoped to strike a happy medium. He disliked the "universal toleration" of the government and at the same time deprecated the claim of any church body for a detailed form of government in all its minutiae as being *jure divino*. In a letter to his learned friend, Thomas Gataker,<sup>77</sup> Baxter spoke of the evils of disunion which threatened the interests of the Reformed Protestant churches. He earnestly advocated the need of effecting a union of worship wherein religious people would feel themselves members of the universal body of Christians, and as a partial solution urged the adoption of the simpler principles involved in a moderate Presbyterianism or Episcopacy.<sup>78</sup> Perhaps Baxter remembered the advice which Francis Bacon had given to James I half a century earlier when he, too, advocated a comprehensive Church wherein men of various intellectual viewpoints could unite in worshipping God in spirit and in truth.<sup>79</sup>

#### IV.

##### *The Development of the Presbyterian Plot*

Thus far in our story we have noted the defiance manifested in the pulpit by the Presbyterian leaders, the pamphlet warfare waged against the Commonwealth government, and the antagonistic position which the Presbyterians assumed toward the policy of toleration advocated by the Republican leaders. These tactics were apparent not only to Parliament and the Council of State, but also to all people who had eyes to see and ears to hear.

At the same time that the Presbyterians were publicly agitating against the Republic, however, they were engaged in secret negotiations which developed into a conspiracy against

<sup>76</sup> Cf. *The City Ministers Unmasked* (London, 1649), 20 f.

<sup>77</sup> A Presbyterian, and the probable author of the *Serious and Faithful Representation*.

<sup>78</sup> Baxter MSS, III, 39, in Dr. Williams' Library; quoted from Drysdale, *History of the Presbyterians*, 366 n.

<sup>79</sup> James Spedding, *Life and Letters of Lord Bacon* (London, 1868-1890), III, 103.

the Commonwealth government. This Presbyterian plot, extending through the period 1649-1651, had for its main objective the restoration of Charles II to the English throne. It had its origin in a coterie of disaffected military officers,<sup>80</sup> a few laymen,<sup>81</sup> and a small group of London clergymen,<sup>82</sup> but it soon came to embrace a considerable number of City ministers and influential citizens. As it developed, it involved negotiations with Charles II, the Scots, exiles in Holland and Scotland, and important laymen in London. Inasmuch as the plan was a treasonable one, contravening the laws of the new Commonwealth,<sup>83</sup> the deliberations were conducted with the utmost secrecy, correspondence was carried on in cipher, and many incriminating documents were deliberately destroyed.<sup>84</sup>

The Presbyterian plot was furthered by suggestions coming from Scotland and Holland.<sup>85</sup> The Scots, who on February 5, 1649, had proclaimed Prince Charles as the new King of Britain, France, and Ireland,<sup>86</sup> desired the assistance of their English co-religionists. For this purpose they sent letters to some of the London ministers, requesting their co-operation.<sup>87</sup> The ministers organized an informal deliberative group in the hope of discovering some means of uniting themselves in confederation with the King and the Scots. In these Scottish overtures, and in the consequent discussions by the London ministers, the Presbyterian plot had its beginning.

It was from Holland, however, that the first impulse for a plan of action came. Alderman James Bunce, a zealous Presbyterian and an agitator of renown, was living in exile at Rotterdam. He had been imprisoned in the Tower during the autumn of 1647 because of his attempts to forestall the advance

80 Great Britain, *Journals of the House of Commons* (London, 1803-[1885]), V, 283. Cited hereafter as *C. J.*

81 *Ibid.*, 315 f.

82 *A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest Period to the Year 1783*, ed. T. B. Howell (London, 1816-1826), V, 67. Cited hereafter as *State Trials*.

83 Great Britain, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*, eds. C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait (London, 1911), II, 193, 365, 407.

84 *State Trials*, V, 73.

85 The background causes were the victories of Cromwell in 1644 and 1645, the increased army participation in governmental affairs after 1646, the Scottish fiasco in August of 1648, Pride's Purge in December of the same year, and the execution of Charles I in January, 1649.

86 Robert Baillie, *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, 1637-1662*, ed. David Laing for the Bannatyne Club (Edinburgh, 1841-1842), III, 458.

87 *State Trials*, V, 67, 83.

of the army on London. Liberated in 1648 by a Parliament dominated by Presbyterians, Bunce renewed his efforts against the Independents. Pride's Purge and the execution of Charles I were the handwriting on the wall, so far as the fate of the City Corporation was concerned, and Alderman Bunce prudently fled to Holland.<sup>88</sup>

Exile is a powerful motive for changing the *status quo* at home. And Bunce, who was widely acquainted with the citizens and clergy of London, and ardent in his opposition to the dictatorship of Cromwell and the Independents, was determined to do his part for himself and his King. Among those with whom he conferred was Captain Silas Titus. He had fought on the parliamentary side during the first Civil War and had favored the idea of a treaty between the King and Parliament. When Charles I was a prisoner at Carisbrooke Castle in the Isle of Wight, Titus had served as a messenger for the King, thereby ingratiating himself with the royal prisoner. And by his participation in the abortive plan for the escape of Charles I from Carisbrooke Castle, he had risked his personal fortune and also possible imprisonment.<sup>89</sup> Very likely in December, 1648, when the army usurped the governmental powers, he had gone to Holland.

It is probable that Bunce and Titus conferred with Sir Joseph Douglas, the Scottish delegate who brought the official news of Charles' proclamation to the King and his diminutive council in Holland.<sup>90</sup> A concerted plan of action was formulated and Titus was commissioned to go to England.

When Titus arrived in London during the latter part of February, 1649, his friends arranged a reception for him. Inasmuch as this group of friends became the nucleus for the Presbyterian plot, it is interesting to note some of their names. Most important and most active was William Drake, owner of a warehouse in London. Drake was a man of wide

<sup>88</sup> Cobbett, *Parliamentary History of England*, III, 839, 840, 874, 877, 881. C. J., V, 315 f. Great Britain, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I, 1645-1647*, ed. W. D. Hamilton (London, 1891), 600.

<sup>89</sup> George Hillier, *A Narrative of the Attempted Escapes of Charles the First from Carisbrooke Castle* (London, 1852), 106-109, 121 f. Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Thirteenth Report*, Appendix, Part I, *The Manuscripts of his Grace the Duke of Portland* (London, 1891), I, 589. Cited hereafter as *Portland Manuscripts*. Bulstrode Whitelock, *Memorials of the English Affairs from the Beginning of the Reign of Charles the First to the Happy Restoration of King Charles the Second* (Oxford, 1853), II, 413.

<sup>90</sup> Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, III, 66, 458.

acquaintance, and had a large number of friends among the London ministers. He was one of the few who had escaped in 1647 when the House of Commons arrested the prime instigators of the City riots.<sup>91</sup> It was he who arranged the reception for Titus, and invited personally or through other friends the guests of the evening.<sup>92</sup> Among those present were Lieutenant-Colonel Jeremiah Baynes, Major John Alford, Major Robert Huntington, and a Mr. Hall. It is fairly certain that other guests of the evening were Colonel Joseph Vaughan, Colonel William Barton, Captain Ralph Farr, and Captain Hugh Massey, brother of Major-General Edward Massey.<sup>93</sup>

At this initial meeting, held at the "Swan," a social *rendezvous* in Dowgate, Captain Titus brought greetings from four English exiles: Francis Lord Willoughby of Parham, Major-General Edward Massey, Colonel Richard Graves, and Alderman James Bunce.<sup>94</sup> He gave information to his friends of conditions on the Continent and told of controversies at the Court of Charles II in Holland. The group listened raptly as he spoke warm words of praise for the young King, then only nineteen years old, and as he extolled his mature judgments and political sagacity. But no man, not even a wise young King, Titus pointed out, could be permanently impervious to the influences of malignant advisers. These wicked counselors who surrounded the young King at every hand were using their subtle devices to ensnare the royal protégé. Daily they were poisoning the mind of Charles II as the counselors of Charles I had done in previous years. If something were not done soon, the utter ruin of Charles II would be as certain and complete as that of Charles I. At that very time, warned Titus, the King's ear was being assaulted with proposals for joining with the Irish papists—those rebels who had been a curse to his father. Immediate action was necessary if England and Charles II were to be saved.<sup>95</sup>

As a consequence of Titus' exhortations, several smaller meetings—steering committee parleys—were held. In these

<sup>91</sup> *State Trials*, V, 124; *C. J.*, V, 317, 323.

<sup>92</sup> *State Trials*, V, 89, 93, 121.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, *passim*.

<sup>94</sup> Francis Lord Willoughby had been a Presbyterian leader in the House of Lords up to 1648. Colonel Richard Graves had been the keeper of Charles I at Holmby House at the time that he was seized by Cornet Joyee and the army in June, 1647.

<sup>95</sup> *State Trials*, V, 98, 183, 185.



informal get-togethers, agenda were prepared, and the formulated plans were presented during March and April, 1649, at two general meetings, the first held at the "White Hart," the second at the "Bear," both inns being located on Bread Street.<sup>96</sup> Strengthened in their cause by letters which Titus had secured from persons of honor,<sup>97</sup> the conspirators drew up an "Address" which was dispatched to Charles II in the name of noblemen, secluded parliamentary members, ministers, citizens, and soldiers. When Charles received the letter through Lord Percy, he stormed at the minister with the questions: "Who are these noblemen and the rest? What can they do for me? Can they raise me ten thousand men?"

Charles could rail in private as much as he pleased. But he was in no position to scorn possible help from any quarter, and he was prevailed upon, therefore, to treat with this English group, which his advisers, particularly Lord Percy and Jermyn, considered as a numerous and influential party.<sup>98</sup> Consequently, Lord Percy's secretary, one Mason, was delegated as a secret agent to go to England. When Mason crossed the Channel, in May or June of 1649, he carried with him instructions as to procedure and letters from Lord Percy replying to the Presbyterian overtures.<sup>99</sup> Immediately upon his arrival in London, Mason communicated with the Countess of Carlisle, a sister of Lord Percy, and wife of the powerful Earl of Carlisle. He conferred also with many ministers and laymen, and met with the Presbyterian conspirators, to whom he brought assurances that if the Scots could be moderated, the King would

96 *Ibid.*, 98. It seems probable that the holding of meetings at the "Swan," at the "White Hart," and at the "Bear" was a policy of caution to escape the watchful eye of the government. Throughout the two years of plotting, rotation of meeting places was the rule. The only exception to this generalization were the several meetings held in the lower room of Christopher Love's home, at a later time when the conspirators could feel more certain of the truthworthiness and zeal of the participants.

97 Were it possible to discover the names of these persons of honor, information might be obtained concerning parliamentary members and noblemen. The names of the Earls of Manchester, Suffolk, and Warwick are mentioned in Love's trial as persons fit to command when the Scots should invade England (*State Trials*, V, 118). But no convincing evidence seems to be extant to prove their direct complicity.

98 *Ibid.*, 67. The current negotiations between Charles II and the Scots were far from successful because of the rigid demands of the latter. (*The Acts of the Parliament of Scotland During the Commonwealth* [Edinburgh, 1872], VI, Part II, 727-32.) Charles and his advisers hoped that the English would collaborate in moderating these demands. At least the effort could be made.

99 *State Trials*, V, 78. William Drake was most likely the man to whom the letters were delivered (*Ibid.*, 92).

be minded to join with them. Mason prevailed upon the ministers, especially Christopher Love, a zealous Presbyterian, to write a letter embodying an urgent request to the Scots to modify their terms to Charles II.<sup>100</sup>

The efforts of the ministers to modify the demands of the Scots were unsuccessful. Adamantine in their convictions, the Scots replied that since their demands were reasonable, the King should be more strongly urged to accept the proffered terms.<sup>101</sup> Sensing that the Scots were inflexible on this point, the English Presbyterians changed their tack by trimming their sails to suit the Scottish winds. They sent one letter to the King with a fulsome expression of their loyalty and a tacit implication of their strength and influence. This letter included a promise that the Presbyterians both in Scotland and England would come to the King's assistance if his Majesty would accept the Covenant and the Scots' terms, but was studiously silent on the vital issue of modifying those terms, or on their inability to move the obdurate Scots. Another letter was dispatched to Queen Henrietta Maria, urging her to use her influence with Charles to accept the stipulated terms. A third letter was sent to Lord Percy and Lord Jermyn. Though the letter is not extant, it must have contained a report on the unsuccessful appeal to the Scots, and a request for procedural recommendations, since the letter evoked a reply wherein the Presbyterians were advised to appoint a delegate who should see that their interests were represented and who should act jointly with the Scotch commissioners at the forthcoming treaty with the King, to be held in the island of Jersey.<sup>102</sup>

On October 11, 1649, the Scotch delegate, George Winram, sailed for Holland. About the first week in November Captain Titus, the representative of the English Presbyterians, crossed

100 *Ibid.*, 68. *Portland Manuscripts*, I, 602.

101 *State Trials*, V, 68, 101.

102 *Ibid.*, 68. The dating of this correspondence is problematical. The negotiations between Charles II and the Scots were broken off in June, 1649. A later possible *terminus a quo* could be August 7, 1649, when George Winram was appointed by the Scottish Parliament to resume treaty discussions. Not until October 11 did Winram sail from Leith for Holland. Thus, conjecturally, sometime in September, after he learned of the decision of the Scottish Parliament, or in October, when he received news of Winram's landing in Holland, Percy advised the English Presbyterians to appoint a delegate to go to Jersey. Sometime in late October or more likely in November, Winram met Titus in Holland, and together they proceeded to Jersey where they arrived December 6, 1649 (S. Elliott Hoskins, *Charles the Second in the Channel Islands*, II, 358).

the Channel and conferred with Lord Willoughby, Major-General Massey, and Alderman Bunce. Winram met this group in Holland and carried on negotiations with them.<sup>103</sup> Toward the end of November, Titus and Winram, together with Colonel Richard Graves and one Major Oude, proceeded to France and from the coast of Normandy embarked for the island of Jersey, where they arrived on December 6, 1649, to confer with King Charles and his group.

When Captain Silas Titus and George Winram arrived in Jersey on December 6, 1649, Charles II and his party had been in the island for almost three months.<sup>104</sup> The King had planned to make Jersey merely a temporary stopping place on his projected trip to Ireland. Unfortunate for the aspirations of the royal exile, however, was the fact that in September, when he landed in Jersey, Cromwell had stormed the Irish city of Drogheda, and the following month, on October 11, 1649, had captured the city of Wexford.<sup>105</sup> Reports of these Irish defeats had reached the King about October 14.<sup>106</sup> When these reports were verified by Henry Seymour, the King's messenger, Charles realized that "the rotten reed of Ireland" had been irreparably broken.

Upsetting as the report was to the royal party, it augured

103 Sir James Balfour, *The Historical Works of Sir James Balfour* (Edinburgh, 1824-1825), III, 432. These conferences seem to have been reported to the government at Westminster by their agent Walter Strickland. On the same day that Strickland's letter was read to Parliament, the House of Commons ordered that the estates of Francis Lord Willoughby, Major-General Massey, and Alderman James Bunce be sequestered (*C. J.*, VI, 337). It can hardly be a coincidence that the order for sequestration in the *Journal of the House of Commons* follows immediately after the report of Strickland's letter on December 25, 1649 (*Ibid.*)

104 In September, 1649, when the English Presbyterians were making arrangements to send Captain Titus to the King, Charles II and his brother, the Duke of York, set out with their attendants from St. Germain near Paris on the first stage of their contemplated trip to Ireland. The royal party arrived at Coutances, a few miles from the French coast, on September 16, and on the following afternoon reached Jersey, where it was lodged in Elizabeth Castle as the guest of Sir George Carteret and the loyal inhabitants of the island (S. Elliott Hoskins, *Charles the Second in the Channel Islands* [London, 1954], II, 303-310).

105 S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-1660* (2d ed.; London, 1897), I, 130 f., 143-148.

106 See the two letters of Lord Byron and Sir Edward Nicholas to the Marquis of Ormonde, October 12, 16, 1649, in Thomas Carte, *A Collection of Original Letters and Papers, Concerning the Affairs of England, from the Year 1641 to 1660* (London, 1739), I, 326. Most likely the disconcerting information regarding Drogheda came to Jersey by dispatches carried on the Irish frigate, the "Cock," which anchored at Jersey on October 14, 1649 (Hoskins, *Charles the Second in the Channel Islands*, II, 334).

well for the aspirations of the Presbyterians, both of Scotland and England.<sup>107</sup> Charles and his party decided to return to Holland and treat with the Scots, the negotiations to begin at Breda on March 15, 1650. When the Scottish commissioners assembled at Breda, the English Presbyterians were represented by Major-General Edward Massey, Colonel Richard Graves, Captain Silas Titus, and Alderman James Bunce. These men were instructed to be guided by the wishes of the Scottish commissioners, who were naturally the dominant group. The agreement reached between the King and the commissioners was completed on May 1 as the Treaty of Breda, and revised thereafter and agreed upon by Charles II on June 11, 1650, as the Treaty of Heligoland. In promising to go to Scotland, to subscribe to the Covenant, and to follow the advice of Scottish counselors, Charles II committed himself to a course of action which the English Presbyterians had advocated strongly.<sup>108</sup> The King's embarkation for Scotland in June, 1650, marked the end of the preparatory phase of the Presbyterian plot, and initiated the final stage of the conspiracy, which was to be a time of preparation, discovery, and defeat.

## V.

### *The Ripening of the Plot and Its Detection*

The man who was delegated by the King and the English Presbyterians in Holland to carry on negotiations and make preparations in England was Thomas Cooke, characterized by Nicholas as "a perfect Presbyterian," a son of Sir John Cooke, Secretary of State to Charles I. Cooke's task was three-fold. First, he was to carry out arrangements made by the King and the Breda commissioners for conferring with the English Presbyterians and collecting money. Second, he was

<sup>107</sup> In the following month of January, 1650, the King wrote to Ormonde: "You will perceive by my public letter, that I have resolved of a treaty with my subjects of Scotland, whereunto I was principally induced by that relation which Harry [Henry] Seymour made to me from you, of the state of things in Ireland; and do believe that an agreement with them (if it may be had upon honourable and just terms) will be the likeliest means to make a speedy and powerful diversion in England" (Carte, *Collection of Original Letters and Papers*, II, 423).

<sup>108</sup> *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland and the Government During the Commonwealth*, VI, Part II, 601. Cf. Gardiner, *Letters and Papers Illustrating the Relations between Charles the Second and Scotland in 1650*, 85, n.

to arrange means of regular communication between London and Edinburgh. Third, he was to solicit the co-operation of some of the leading men of England.<sup>109</sup>

Cooke arrived in England during the latter part of June, 1650. He went directly to Cobham in Kent where he called on the Duke of Richmond. Proceeding to London, he called at the store of George Thomason, the book-seller, to whom he made himself known by special tokens supplied by Alderman Bunce. Thomason, who was commended to Cooke as one who "knew the affections of most of the citizens and also of the ministers," proved to be of real service to Cooke and enabled him to make the acquaintance of numerous conspirators.

Very likely it was through such men as Thomason that Sir Richard Page, who had accompanied Cooke from Holland, was able to promote the plot in London. Page brought with him a letter from Charles II directed to Edmund Calamy, James Cranford, William Jenkins, and Christopher Love, Presbyterian ministers in London. The letter contained an account of the Treaty of Breda, and included a promise of what the King would do for the settlement of the Presbyterian religion in England. It concluded with a plea that the ministers use their influence in their congregations and elsewhere, that they pray for the King privately, and that they join with him publicly when the proper occasion arose.<sup>110</sup>

The ministers were heartened by the encouragement afforded by the King's letter and the successful completion of the treaty with the Scots. Special fasts were inaugurated during the fall and winter of 1650-1651.<sup>111</sup> At these meetings clergymen prayed for the restoration of King Charles II and for the "good of the two nations." Further, when the conjunction of the Scots and the King had become a reality at Breda, the English Presbyterians began the solicitation of funds. Inasmuch as such an enterprise was a treasonable one, contravening the Act of March 17, 1649, the collectors had

109 *Portland Manuscripts*, I, 587, 588, 597, 598.

110 *Ibid.*, 599.

111 One minister, John Jaquel, testified later that he had attended twenty fasts (*A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and Other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest Period to the Year 1783* ed. T. B. Howell [London, 1816], V, 117. Cited hereafter as *State Trials*). If we assume that the meetings were held regularly, and that the forty weeks from August, 1650, to May, 1651, constituted approximately the period referred to by Jaquel, the fasts were held every other week.



to proceed cautiously. One method advocated was that the ministers should visit several of their influential friends from whom they would ask a "loan" of £10 to £50 for a "charitable purpose." Another device was the solicitation of voluntary contributions of money at meetings held in various homes.<sup>112</sup> Among the laymen, Dr. Roger Drake, William Drake, and Mr. Hougarden, a Dutch merchant in London, were active. But the most energetic person in collecting money was Alderman Bunce. From his headquarters in Holland, Bunce carried on negotiations with friends in England, Scotland, the Netherlands, and France. Of his efforts it was related later by Cooke that "all the exchanges in Christendom are layed by Alderman Bunce for return of money for the service of the design now in hand in Scotland and by correspondence he draws from all other marts to Rotterdam and Amsterdam."<sup>113</sup>

In December, 1650, Colonel Bamfield, an English agent in Scotland, arrived in London, bringing with him a letter from Argyle, Loudon, and Lothian. These lords, who represented the Committee of Estates in Scotland, requested that the English Presbyterians raise money for arms and ammunition. Although this request was not complied with, the Presbyterian party in London sent £300 to Scotland for the personal needs of Massey, Titus, and Graves, their representatives in Edinburgh. And they carried on a guarded correspondence with the General Assembly, with Scottish government officials, and with their own agents.

Although the Presbyterians corresponded by cipher and by unsigned letters, their precautions were not sufficient to keep their activities hidden from the Commonwealth authorities. One of the secret service agents of the government, Major John Cobbett, had managed to elicit from one of the conspirators, Major Thomas Adams, information about the Presbyterian plottings. After Adams had incriminated himself, though but slightly, Major Cobbett compelled him, by threatening to bring charges of treason, to reveal fully the plans of the conspirators. Thereafter, Major Adams, working with Thomas Scott, a member of the Council of State, and with the Committee of Examinations, continued to take notice of the fasts held by the ministers, reported their activ-

<sup>112</sup> *State Trials*, V, 129. *A Short Plea for the Commonwealth*, (London, 1651), 9.

<sup>113</sup> *Portland Manuscripts*, I, 581.

ities, and later received £10 reward for his information.<sup>114</sup>

More damaging to the cause of the English Presbyterians than the spying activities of Adams, however, was the arrest of Isaac Birkenhead and Thomas Cooke in March, 1651. Birkenhead was an agent of communication between the Earl of Derby, the English Presbyterians, and the Royalists in Scotland. While on his way to the Isle of Man, Birkenhead was seized by Cromwell's men at Greenock, Scotland, while his ship was temporarily anchored there. Cromwell reported the arrest to the Council of State and informed it that he was sending the prisoner to London.<sup>115</sup> At the same time the news spread quickly to other localities. When the upsetting report came to Lancashire, it induced Major William Ashurst and Sir Thomas Tyldesley, two royalist Presbyterians who were seeking to enlist aid for Charles II, to flee to the Isle of Man, "prevented the delivery of commissions in that county, and stopped a general rising of the Presbyterians, who were provided with arms and ammunitions, and had intended to seize Liverpool."<sup>116</sup>

Accompanying Cromwell's letter were several papers discovered in Birkenhead's possession, some of which revealed the prominent rôle played by Thomas Cooke in plotting against the government. By March 18, Thomas Scott had reported from the Council to the Parliament a summary of the Birken-

114 It is impossible to date the beginning of Major Adams' cooperation with the Council of State. January or February, 1651, would be a likely time. In the summer of 1651, when Christopher Love was on trial for his life, he was successful in securing from Major Cobbett an admission that he had utilized the services of Major Adams, had paid his wife money, and had given assurance of succor to Adams in his own difficulties with the State. There is an intimation in the trial record that Thomas Scott had promised Major Adams some form of preferment (*State Trials*, V, 112). It is not surprising, therefore, in the light of the treacherous methods of Adams, that Love termed him a hired witness, a veritable Tobiah and Sanballat combined (*Cal. St. P., Dom. Ser., 1651*, III, 439, 478; *State Trials*, V, 112). And in later years, when Richard Baxter, the beloved minister at Kidderminster, Worcestershire, reflected on the trial of Love, he spoke of Adams as "the guilty brother" (*Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ed. Matthew Sylvester [London, 1696], 66).

On August 18, 1652, Parliament resolved to present Major Adams with land in Ireland worth £200 annually as a reward for his information regarding the Presbyterian conspiracy. In addition, Parliament granted him £100 for the cost of transporting his family and possessions to Ireland (*C. J.*, VII, 166; *Cal. St. P., Dom. Ser., 1651-1652*, IV, 355).

115 *Cal. St. P., Dom. Ser. 1651*, III, 83, 88; see S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate* (2d ed., London; 1897), I, 406.

116 *Tracts Relating to Military Proceedings in Lancashire During the Great Civil War*, ed. George Ormerod (n. p., printed for the Chetham Society, 1844), 313 n.

head papers. On the same day Thomas Cooke was arrested and some of his papers were seized. He was brought immediately before the Council and required to give testimony under oath. When Cooke was committed later in the day to the custody of the Sergeant, he managed to escape. Since the Council considered his revelations important, it hurried an act through Parliament on March 20, 1651, declaring Cooke a traitor unless he surrendered himself by March 24.<sup>117</sup> Cooke was arrested on March 29, five days after the surrender date set by Parliament, and consequently his life was at the mercy of the state. He was given an opportunity to save himself, however, by making a complete confession of all he knew. When the Council began his examinations on April 1, Cooke, who was not made of martyr stuff, unbosomed himself of such a series of names, events, and plans, that the Council must have been surprised. During the two months of April and May he wrote out twenty-one long depositions filled with incriminating evidence.<sup>118</sup> To oblige the Committee of Examinations and to refresh his own memory, Cooke, writing as a supposedly free agent, even penned a treacherous letter on April 3 to a correspondent in Rotterdam, from whom he requested a list of all persons who would be useful in person, or reputation.<sup>119</sup> Though the correspondent, Colonel Thornhill, evidently refused to be tricked,<sup>120</sup> the fact that Cooke wrote such a letter indicated his complete submission to the demands of the Council of State.

The revelations of Cooke resulted in the full discovery of the Presbyterian plot.<sup>121</sup> Cooke revealed not only the details of the conspiracy but also the names of the plotters—ministers, ex-army officials, and citizens. Among the first to be arrested

117 *C. J.*, VI, 551. Five hundred pounds reward was offered for Cooke's discovery, and a special messenger was sent to Milburne, Derbyshire, to sequester his estate (*C. J.*, VI, 551; *Cal. St. P., Dom. Ser.*, 1651, III, 97).

118 *Cal. St. P., Dom. Ser.*, 1651, III, 222; *C. J.*, VI, 579.

119 *Cal. St. P., Dom. Ser.*, 1651, III, 130.

120 A certain Mr. Clarke, evidently a secret agent for the Commonwealth, wrote a letter from Breda to an unnamed official in London, wherein he stated: "Cooke's letter to Thornhill will never be answered, about the Kentish business, or the engagers; but Cooke is fearfully cursed and all his friends here, as Sir Richard Page, and a great many more, ill thought of because of him (*Original Letters and Papers of State, Addressed to Oliver Cromwell*, ed., John Nickolls, Jr. [London, 1743], 65).

121 One immediate result of Cooke's statements was an order from the Council of State to the Militia Committee of London, cautioning it to be ready for any uprisings (*Ibid.*, 131).

were George Thomason, renowned stationer of London, and Captain Henry Potter.<sup>122</sup> Thomason was arrested about April 8, 1651. The Council ordered him to write out a deposition, and when Thomason complied, his statements were used to refresh Cooke's memory and verify his statements.<sup>123</sup>

Part of the deposition made by Thomason referred to Alderman James Bunce, whom Cooke had sought to shield.<sup>124</sup> By means of both depositions the Council learned of the key position occupied by Bunce in the conspiracy. As a result of this information, the Council, on April 14, 1651, ordered a draft of an act to be prepared, "declaring all who hold correspondence with the enemies of the Commonwealth, and especially with James Bunce, late alderman of London, guilty of high treason."<sup>125</sup> A week later, on April 22, the Council requested the Law Committee to prepare a proclamation "imposing a penalty upon all who presume to hold intelligence or traffic with James Bunce, late alderman of London."<sup>126</sup>

Like Thomason, Captain Potter revealed to the Council of State what he knew of the Presbyterian conspiracy.<sup>127</sup> Their confessions, which substantiated parts of the many depositions of Cooke, resulted in the arrest of several London

122 On May 28, 1651, the Council of State presented to Parliament a full report of the depositions of Cooke and subjoined the following statement: "Mr. Thomas Cooke's information hath been made use of . . . against Captain Potter and Mr. Thomason, solely discovered and apprehended upon his information, which occasioned the first proceeds against the treasons of some of those of the Presbyterians judgment" (*Cal. St. P., Dom. Ser., 1651* III, 222; *Portland Manuscripts*, 603 f.).

123 *Portland Manuscripts*, 586. Thomason was kept in prison until May 27, 1651, when he was liberated on bail of £1,000 (*Cal. St. P., Dom. Ser., 1651*, III, 218). An order of the Council on June 2, 1651, saved his estate from sequestration (*Ibid.*, 230). Inasmuch as Thomason had carried one of Charles II's letters from Alderman Bunce to the London ministers, had received details of the Treaty of Breda from Cooke, and had been fully aware of the plans of the Presbyterian conspirators, it is surprising that he was treated so leniently by the Council of State. His failure to divulge information which he had known for nine months unquestionably made him guilty of misprision of treason. There is a brief summary of the arrest, imprisonment, examination, and release of Thomason in the *Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts Relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and Restoration, Collected by George Thomason, 1640-1661*, ed. G. K. Fortescue (London, 1908), I, x.

124 *Portland Manuscripts*, 586, 604.

125 *Cal. St. P., Dom. Ser., 1651*, III, 147.

126 *Ibid.*, 162.

127 Potter was arrested in April, 1651, and required to make several detailed depositions to the Committee of Examinations (*State Trials*, V, 81, 88). He was committed to the Tower on May 6, 1651, to await trial before the High Court of Justice on a charge of treason (*Cal. St. P., Dom. Ser., 1651*, III, 180).

ministers. On May 2, 1651, the Council of State arrested seven suspects.<sup>128</sup> Thomas Case, Dr. Roger Drake,<sup>129</sup> William Jenkins, and Christopher Love<sup>130</sup> were the four ministers who were first taken into custody, and the laymen arrested were Sir Matthew Brand, John Gibbons, and Captain Hugh Massey. On May 17 Captain Ralph Farr was apprehended<sup>131</sup> and on May 20, Dr. John Bastwick was ordered by the Council to appear before the Committee of Examinations.<sup>132</sup> On the same day, the Council ordered that a letter be sent to the governor of Dunster Castle, Major Robinson, directing him to search the rooms of William Prynne.<sup>133</sup>

George Clarke, who had been at Breda to volunteer the services of his brother-in-law, William Prynne, was arrested by the Council on June 5, 1651,<sup>134</sup> and two days later Colonel Joseph Vaughan was brought into the custody of the Council messenger because of his co-operation with the plotters.<sup>135</sup> On June 11, the Council directed the Committee of Examinations to summon Colonel Daniel Souton and a Lieutenant-Colonel Jackson on suspicion of treason. The same day the Council ordered that William Blackmore, Daniel Cawdrey, Thomas Cawton, James Cranford, Matthew Haviland, Richard Herrick, Arthur Jackson, John Jacquel,<sup>136</sup> James Nalton, Ralph Robinson, and Thomas Watson—all ministers—be placed in safe custody, questioned concerning their participation in the London conspiracy, and if implicated in any way reported to the Council of State.<sup>137</sup>

128 *Ibid.*, 179-89; *Original Letters and Papers of State Addressed to Oliver Cromwell*, ed. John Nickolls Jr., 66.

129 The index of the *Calendar of State Papers, 1651*, III, identifies Richard Drake with Roger Drake. The latter is the Dr. Drake referred to five times in the *Calendar*. The lone reference to Richard Drake probably is not relevant to the Presbyterian conspiracy. These two men, in turn, should not be confused with William Drake, arch-conspirator of the Presbyterians. William Drake was the son of Dr. Roger Drake (*C. J.*, V, 323).

130 In his article on Christopher Love in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, William A. Shaw erroneously gives the date for Love's arrest as May 14.

131 *Ibid.*, 205.

132 *Ibid.*, 208. Dr. Bastwick must have been released shortly after the Council had questioned him. There is no record of his imprisonment, and there is no evidence of his participation in the plot.

133 The Council hoped to discover the letter which King Charles II had sent from Scotland to Prynne (*Portland Manuscripts*, 594).

134 *Cal. St. P., Dom. Ser.*, 1651, III, 238.

135 *Ibid.*, 240.

136 Jacquel's name is variously given as Jethell, Jekell, and Jekyll in the *Cal. St. P., Dom. Ser.*, 1651, III, 245, 249, 253.

137 *Ibid.*, 247. With the exception of Richard Herrick, who was a clergyman in



The discovery of the Presbyterian plot and the arrest of the ringleaders marked the complete triumph of the government over the Presbyterian conspirators. Two of the arch-conspirators, Christopher Love and John Gibbons, were executed, and the remaining men were kept in prison. After September 3, 1651, when Cromwell's men had decisively defeated the forces of Charles II at Worcester, the government could afford to relax its vigilance and to show a more lenient attitude toward those languishing in prison. Gradually they were released so that by April 20, 1653, when the Rump Parliament was forcibly dissolved by Cromwell, all of the prisoners except Major General Browne had been liberated.<sup>138</sup> Thereafter their submission to the government was complete and the opposition of the Presbyterians to Cromwell's government collapsed.

Manchester, Lancashire, these men were all London ministers. Of the ten men, six were apprehended by the Council. Thomas Cawton and James Cranford escaped to Rotterdam; Daniel Cawdrey and James Nalton probably went into hiding, but Nalton was arrested at a later date. Conceivably, Cawdrey may have been released after questioning by the Council.

- 138 One would think that the Act of General Pardon and Oblivion should have given Browne his freedom. The fact that the government kept Browne in prison indicates the hostility which the Commonwealth officials felt toward him, and the importance which they attached to his action of having abetted the Scottish invasion of 1648. In 1659, when Browne related his experiences to a sympathetic Parliament, he stated that he had been imprisoned for five years (Thomas Burton, *Diary of Thomas Burton*, ed. John Towill Rutt [4 vols.; London, 1828], IV, 263 f.). Thus, he must have been liberated in December, 1653, or January, 1654, since his imprisonment began on December 12, 1648. As sheriff of London, he was most active in opposing the rise of the Cromwellian party.

## PRINTING AND THE GROWTH OF A PROTESTANT MOVEMENT IN GERMANY FROM 1517 TO 1524

LOUISE W. HOLBORN

*Wellesley College*

The Reformation was the first religious movement which had the aid of the printing press. It was the first intellectual movement in which the printing press had a popular effect. The importance of printing for the spread of the Reformation has long been recognized but there has been little detailed investigation of the interaction of the two great revolutionary developments.<sup>1</sup>

The advantage which a reformer is able to derive from the press is at once evident. The failure of the Hussite reform, in contrast to the effectiveness of the Lutheran, was due in part to the limited means available for spreading the ideas of Hus. It is known that Hus impressed the German people greatly. People hailed him with the expectation that his brave stand would bring the defeat of Rome, a hope which already animated many. On his way to Constance the Nuremberg burghers lined the road along which the Bohemian reformer passed. Even the clergy applauded when he openly defended his theses. But though Hus made a great personal impression on the people of his time, there was no external means of spreading his ideas. Thus the Church was able to nip in the bud the nascent revolt.

In contrast, Luther and his adversaries could support their spoken arguments with extensive printed material. Moreover, its convenient form and inexpensive price facilitated the rapid and wide distribution of this material throughout the country. The religious issues could be read of and pondered over in the quietness of the home or in the company of friends. For those who could not read, there was the possibility of hearing the arguments read by others or even of guessing at the contents of a work from the illustrative material included,

<sup>1</sup> For detailed studies of the history of the booktrade and of printing see Kapp, F., *Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels* (Leipzig, 1907), I; Bogeng, G. A. E., *Geschichte der Buchdruckerkunst* (Dresden, 1936, 2 vols.).

usually in the form of woodcuts. For the first time, a religious and intellectual movement was not restricted to learned groups but had an immediate impact upon the people at large. This situation, an outgrowth of the development of the printing press, was one of the major factors in transforming a complicated theological debate into a great popular movement. The Reformation might have been stifled and suppressed had it not been for its powerful ally, the German pamphlet. Conversely, the influence of Luther was decisive in transforming printing from an art into an instrument for moulding public thinking.

When Luther made his first public appearance in 1517, the art of book printing had been in existence for over half a century. Mainz, the birthplace of printing, was the first centre for printers and booksellers. Book printing spread from there in the last third of the fifteenth century to Bamberg, Strassburg, Cologne, Basle, Zurich, Augsburg, Ulm, Nuremberg, Leipzig, Vienna, Magdeburg, and Tübingen. In addition to these main centres, smaller printing presses were founded in Speyer, Esslingen, Prague, Erfurt, Passau, Memingen, Munich, Reutlingen, Heidelberg, Münster, Regensburg, Ingolstadt, Hagenau, Hamburg, and others. Six of the larger centres, Leipzig, Cologne, Basle, Nuremberg, Augsburg, and Strassburg, three of them university towns, produced nearly two-thirds of the output of the German presses up to the end of the fifteenth century. This development provided both well established centres and a network of presses, particularly in the western and southern parts of the country.<sup>2</sup>

By the sixteenth century, printing had become one of the most important of the arts. Under the stimulus provided by capitalistic entrepreneurs who were also educated men and artists, it was developing into an industry with a basis of differentiated function and a secured labor supply.<sup>3</sup> The printer had drawn into his work representatives of the special arts

2 In 1480 there were about thirty printing-shops in Germany while by 1500 these had expanded to about 200; see Bogeng, A., *Buchdruckerkunst*, I: *Der Frühdruck*, 273-77.

3 See Sombart, W., *Der moderne Kapitalismus*, (Leipzig, 1921, 4th edition), II, 719, 759; and Hase, O., *Die Koberger* (2nd edition, Leipzig, 1885). For the economic and intellectual conditions in Germany in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries see Below, G., *Probleme der Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (2nd edition, Tübingen, 1926); Bezold, F. v., *Aus Mittelalter und Renaissance* (Berlin, 1918) 242-44; Bezold, F. v., *Geschichte der deutschen Reformation* (Berlin, 1890); Ranke, L. v., *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation* (Leipzig, 1867, 4th edition), II.

of medieval craftsmanship such as copyists, book binders, goldsmiths, rubricators, illuminators, and miniature painters. The mechanical processes of printing were becoming differentiated and standardized as printing began to reach beyond the small scale reproduction of the form achieved by the medieval manuscript. The profits which were beginning to accrue from use of the reproductive potentialities of the printing press attracted both labor and capital and facilitated the spread of presses in the urban centres which provided both demand for the product and capital resources. By the sixteenth century, the functions of publisher, printer, and bookseller, originally combined, had become separated in many cases. The publisher sometimes controlled a number of presses and attempted to create as well as meet demand. Wholesale booksellers (or as they were pointedly called in German, *Buchführer*) appeared toward the end of the fifteenth century and developed fixed centres of distribution in places where demand was considerable, and hawkers and peddlars took smaller and more popular works to fairs, markets, and church festivals and carried them through country districts.

The humanistic movement made use of the printing press. The Brethren of the Common Life, in many respects the forerunners and founders of the new intellectual movement, could take much credit to themselves for the spread of book printing. The leading publishers of the age had a well-rounded education and were able to understand and evaluate the literary treasures of the past. Men like Johannes Frobenius and Aldus Manutius became the allies of Erasmus, Johann Reuchlin, and others in their efforts for the renascence of the classics. The literary struggle against "the obscure men" (*Reuchlinstreit*) made particular use of the publicists' weapons (Boecking mentions forty-four writings printed between 1515 and 1521 in this controversy), and its effect spread beyond the scholastic world. However, none of the writings of the humanist groups had a decisive or even kindling effect on the people in general. The chief reason was that these writers wrote only for scholars and thus used the Latin language almost exclusively. Some of their writings were translated into German and in this form were read by larger groups. But their dignified scepticism and constantly critical tone did not kindle enthusiasm, while their rough satire awoke only a temporary exhilaration. A move-

ment whose best literary results were clothed in Latin and were almost entirely analytical effected only a clarification of issues, not a change in the public mind.

Two things were necessary before printing could be an effective agent in moulding public opinion. The first was that technical facilities should be available for large scale publication. This had been secured. The rapid expansion of publishing in the early years of the Reformation which increased the quantity of printing ninefold in little over eight years, was only possible because of the foundation which had already been laid.<sup>4</sup> The second was to develop a form, style, and content which would attract a wide group of readers. This was to be one of Luther's great contributions.

Up to the Reformation the church was the printer's best customer. The finest types were cut for use in mass-books, psalters, breviaries, rituals, missals, etc. In addition to these, medieval classics, texts of Roman law, and scientific works were printed. These were produced in lavish style, each a work of art. The cost of most of them was prohibitive except for the very wealthy. Moreover the almost exclusive use of Latin restricted them to educated groups. Thus the church, schools, and scholars absorbed practically the whole output of the book trade. In turn they demanded the standard achieved in the medieval manuscript of a well designed and finely executed work of art.

By attracting a great new group of customers Luther caused a fundamental change in the primary purpose of printing. For mass sale, quality had to be sacrificed to quantity. Printing changed from an art satisfying in itself to a vehicle to convey ideas and material.

The transformation in the aim of the printers due to the change in market was caused by three great contributions made by Luther, a new language, a new form and a new content. The three together created works which could be understood by the great mass of people, could be conveniently handled,

<sup>4</sup> See Panzer, G. W., *Annalen der älteren deutschen Literatur* (2 vols., Nürnberg, 1788, 1805); Kuczinski, A., *Verzeichnis einer Sammlung von 3000 Flugschriften Luthers und seiner Zeitgenossen* (Leipzig, 1870/71); Weller, E., *Repertorium typographicum. Die deutsche Literatur im ersten Viertel des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Nördlingen, 1864). These three together with the recently published bibliography by Schottenloher, K., *Bibliographie zur Deutschen Glaubensspaltung*, (Leipzig, 1933-39) provide the main printed sources of information concerning the German publications of that period.



and most significant of all, were in constant demand because they answered a deeply felt need.

Luther's use of the vernacular and his creative ability to mould it into a superb instrument for the transmission of ideas are so well known as to need only statement. It should be emphasized, however, that he is the founder of literary German, his language being as effective in writing as in speaking.

Luther's second great contribution was to popularize a new form for serious works. Up to the Reformation, printing was customarily in folio size. Luther was the pioneer of the pamphlet made up of a few quarto or octavo sheets, devoted to a serious purpose. In using this easily handled publication Luther was building on a type introduced in the last quarter of the fifteenth century for popular use. This was a one-page leaflet or broadside which had a striking picture and often a short readable text on one of a variety of subjects ranging from reports on exciting phenomena like tempests to official edicts, letters of indulgence, advertisements, and even invitations to riflemen's associations. They were usually anonymous. The first writer of reputation to use these popular leaflets successfully was Sebastian Brant, the author of the *Ship of Fools*. Parallel with the adoption of this form by some distinguished authors was their decoration by artists of rank like Hans Burgkmair and Albrecht Dürer. Out of the broadside grew the pamphlet, still rare before the Reformation, an inexpensive form, small (rarely more than three or four printed sheets), and designed for quick sale.

Luther's innovation was to use the pamphlet form extensively and for serious works such as sermons and homilies. In so doing he was breaking sharply with convention. He defends himself against the criticism he incurred over the form of his "*Sexternlein*," a six page pamphlet, in his dedication of the *Sermon on Good Works* to Duke Johann of Saxony on March 29, 1520. There he maintains that he, too, could publish big and learned books but that it is more important to write for the common layman.<sup>5</sup>

5 " . . . Ob grosz und viel bucher machen kunst sey und besserlich der Christenheit, lass ich andere richten. Ich acht aber, szo ich lust het, yhrer kunst nach grosz bucher zu machen, es solt vielleicht mit gotlicher hulff mir schleuniger folgen, dan yhnen nach meyner art eynen kleynen sermon zu machen . . ." *W. A.*, VI, 203, 10.

The response justified his use of the pamphlet form, for it had a sudden and overwhelming popularity. It was cheap (one or two groschen), written in German, decorated with a woodcut which indicated the character of the contents, and carried a simple and direct message. It became the most common and influential vehicle for the spread of Luther's ideas.

Important as were the language and the pamphlet form, they were but technical aids in reaching the people. The main reason for the appeal and success of Luther's writings was their new message. The hierarchy of the church was a religious institution that could be fought successfully only on religious grounds. This could only be done by showing that the road to God did not lead through the absolute authority of the clergy. Luther's doctrine of justification by faith challenged the old church tenets. It was a plain doctrine at once profound and simple, and thus could be understood by both the learned and the uneducated. For Luther, religion was a living whole, which evolved out of a few simple, but inexhaustibly deep fundamental thoughts. Consequently he was able to present the same basic thoughts over and over again with a moving seriousness and a warm fervor, with a directness and practicality that obviated monotony and made a lasting impression.<sup>6</sup>

In comparison with the religious writings of the Middle Ages those of Luther are simple, without allegories, legends, and anecdotes. His writings are not abstract nor are they mere compilations. He writes about religious matters as one to whom religion has become an immediate experience. It is not without reason that Luther has been called not only a "prophet" but also the first great "journalist." He was well aware that writing demanded a different technique from speaking. He chided printers for taking a sermon to be published before he had had time to revise it. There is a great difference, he said, between bringing a message directly with "a lively voice" or giving it in "dead writing." His ability to present material in writing so as to carry the same effect as would the spoken word had great influence not only in spreading his ideas but also in popularizing publications. When it was

<sup>6</sup> See Holl, K., *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, (Tübingen, 1921), 340-43; Dannenbauer, H., *Luther als religiöser Volksschriftsteller, 1517-1520*, (Tübingen, 1930).

combined with a message for which people were longing, the effect was irresistible.

Already in the years from 1517-1520, Luther was the most widely read and most influential writer on religious subjects in Germany. Leaving aside the scientific and purely theological writings which he published in that period, Luther produced in these four years about thirty different popular writings of a devotional and instructive character for the common man. These included a popular short explanation of penance, indulgence, and grace, several short and illuminating interpretations of the Ten Commandments, of Faith, and of the Lord's Prayer, a guide to atonement, a preparation for receiving the sacraments, considerations about Christ's passion, about preparation for death, about the three sacraments of the Holy Supper, baptism, and penance, exegeses of some psalms, and also some sermons.

In attempting to measure the response to Luther's message, calculations must be somewhat rough because of the lack of accurate statistical material. All indications are, however, that there was an amazing circulation of Luther's works.

As soon as Luther published a writing in Wittenberg, which became the dominant printing center during the Reformation period, other places like Leipzig, Nuremberg, Augsburg, Strassburg, and Basle printed and reprinted it, usually at two, three, or four printing presses in the city at once. The average number of editions of the popular works published up to 1520 was twelve, some having fewer but others as many as twenty-four. Of the thirty writings which Luther published between March, 1517, and the summer of 1520, about 370 editions had already been printed by the latter year.

In estimating the size of an edition, there are certain earlier examples from which deductions can be drawn. In 1498 it had been agreed in Lübeck that an edition should include one thousand copies. In 1511 the first Latin grammar of Cochlaeus had a thousand copies in the first edition in Nuremberg, the third edition in Strassburg in 1515 being of the same size. The theologies used in universities had 1000 copies in an edition at the beginning of sixteenth century. If, as these examples indicate, 1000 copies was the average size of an edition of Luther's writings, then one-third of a million copies

of his works were spread throughout Germany between 1517 and 1520.<sup>7</sup>

In 1520, when Luther published his three most famous Reformation writings, printing increased still more. Four thousand copies of Luther's *Appeal to the German Nobility* were printed in August, 1520, by Melchior Lotther in Wittenberg. In a letter of August 18, 1520, Luther was asked by his friend Johann Lang to hold back this "wild pamphlet." His answer was that the publication could not be withdrawn since the whole edition had already been distributed in all directions and the printer and publisher would suffer great loss if asked to withdraw the copies. Within a week of the publication of the first edition, Luther was preparing a second one. Including plagiarisms and pirated editions, the work ran through fifteen editions. The tract on *Christian Freedom* went through eighteen editions and gave the basis for dozens of other pamphlets written by different authors.

In the fall of 1522, Luther's translation of the New Testament appeared. The first edition included 3000 copies and a second edition followed in December. The translation of the Bible sold even more widely than any of Luther's other writings.

A few other illustrations of the popularity of Luther's writings may be given. His sermon given in Erfurt on his way to the Diet of Worms and printed by his friends went through nine editions. The speech of defense at Worms on April 18, 1521, generally attributed to Luther, was published in Latin in four editions. The German translation of the speech went through five editions. There were two derivative editions in the form of pamphlets which gave short reports of the memorable days at Worms.

Besides the editions printed from the manuscript, the rapid and far spread distribution of Luther's writings was furthered by constant reprinting from printed copies. With the exception of a few localized printing privileges, there was nothing comparable to a modern copyright. For the printers

7 For the size and number of editions see Dannenbauer, H., *Luther*, 30, note 65, and 31, note 66; Kawerau, G., *Luthers Schriften* (2nd edition, Leipzig, 1929; *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*, Nr. 147); *Luthers Werke*, Gesamtausgabe, Weimarer Ausgabe; Clemen, O. "Buchdruck der deutschen Reformation" in: Bogeng, *Buchdruckerkunst*, II, 38-40; Schottenloher, K., *Flugblatt und Zeitung* (Berlin, 1922).

and booksellers the reprint was an important source of income. In general, Luther never complained about the reprinting of his writings, being aware doubtless of its value in spreading his teaching. The *Sermon of Indulgence and Grace*, the summary in German of Luther's Ninety-five Theses of October 31, 1517, in which he explained them to the laymen in simple understandable words, had many reprints and a correspondingly great effect.<sup>8</sup> Thirteen reprints in High German and one in Low German appeared in 1518 in Wittenberg, Leipzig, Nuremberg, Augsburg, and Basle, in 1519 there were five more in Leipzig, Basle, and Breslau, in 1520 four in Wittenberg, Leipzig, Nuremberg, and Augsburg, and there is in addition, one without date.

In 1541, Luther wrote in *Wider Hans Worst* that his theses had run through Germany in two weeks. How quickly the reprinters got hold of manuscripts is shown also by the fact that Adam Petri in Basle published a reprint of the September edition of Luther's New Testament before the end of 1522. In this case, however, Luther protested since it damaged the printer in Wittenberg if reprints appeared at other places before the original first edition had been sold. Even more serious was a case in 1525 in which a manuscript which was still under the press and not yet finished was stolen and appeared in print in Nuremberg. On the whole, however, Luther objected to reprinting only in the case of the larger and more expensive works or when it endangered the profits of the original printer and publisher. He did not try to prevent it for pamphlets whose effect was meant to be immediate and as widespread as possible.<sup>9</sup>

Luther's message and the success of his medium introduced a vogue of pamphlets written in German which were produced and distributed throughout the country. The pamphlets are the "shock troops" of the Reformation. Their extraordinary richness and effectiveness demand separate and

<sup>8</sup> *Luthers Briefe* ed. by de Wette und Seidermann, I, 72, 95; also *Luthers Werke, Erlanger Ausgabe*, 26, 68 ff. and *W.A.* 1, 311; Luther, Joh., *Vorbereitung und Verbreitung von Martin Luthers 95 Thesen* (Berlin, 1933).

<sup>9</sup> For Luther's attitude towards reprinting and pirating see his letters to the Magistrate in Nuremberg on September 26, 1525 and to the Elector John Frederick on July 8, 1539, printed in *The Letters of Martin Luther*, sel. and trans. by M. A. Currie (London, 1908), 144-45; see also Kunze, H., "Ueber den Nachdruck im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert" in *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* (1938), 135-43.



extended consideration. It is only possible here to indicate a few of their general characteristics.<sup>10</sup>

These pamphlets contained popular writing, addressed to the uneducated groups, but they were written by educated men who had experience in the craftsmanship of printing. They do not come from the common people although they often purposely attempt to give this appearance. Thus a large number of the pamphlets are anonymous and often intentionally hide or are misleading as to the place of printing. This is partly to escape the censorship or personal attacks but also partly in order to give the impression that the writings were the expression of public thought.

Apart from those pamphlet writers who signed their names, like Ulrich von Hutten, Eberlin von Günzburg, Heinrich von Kettenbach, Balthasar Stanberger, Michael Stifel, Utz Eskstein, Johann Brenz, Nikolaus Hermann, Johann Lachmann, Andreas Osiander, Hans Sachs, Ulrich Bossler, Matthias Zell, Matthias Bynwalth, Aegidius Mechler, Nikolaus Hausmann, Gretzinger, Kellner and others, it has been possible to identify many of the authors. The writers were often of good educational and high social standing like the Würzburger choir-master, Dr. Friedrich Fischer, Joachim von Watt, Wilibald Pirckheimer, Lazarus Spengler, Sebastian von Rotenhan, and Hermann von dem Busche, evangelical theologians who had humanistic training like Nikolaus von Amsdorf, Justus Jonas, Johann Lang, Urbanus Rhegius, Oekolampad, Martin Butzer, Paul Phrygio, Wenzelaus Linck, and Johannes Römer, evangelical preachers like Christoph Schappeler, Sebastian Meyer, and Berchtold Haller, or literary laymen like Knight Hartmut von Cronberg, Gengenbach at Basle, Niklaus Manuel at Bern. There are also the bell-founder Hans Füessli, the weaver Ulrich Richsen, the furrier Sebastian Lotzer, the baker Hans Stayg-

10 On the pamphlet literature see particularly Blochwitz, G., "Die antirömischen deutschen Flugschriften der frühen Reformationszeit (bis 1522) in ihrer religiös-sittlichen Eigenart," in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, Vol. 27, 145-254; for collections of pamphlet literature see Berger, A., *Die Sturmtruppen der Reformation* (Leipzig, 1931); Clemen, O., *Flugschriften aus der Reformationszeit in Facsimiledrucken*. Neue Folge der Flugschriften aus den ersten Jahren der Reformation (Leipzig, 1921); Clemen, O., *Flugschriften aus den ersten Jahren der Reformation* (4 vols., Leipzig, 1907-1911); Enders, L., ed. *Johann Eberlin von Günzburg* (3 vols., Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts. *Flugschriften aus der Reformationszeit XI, XV, XVIII*, Halle, 1826-1902); Schade, O., *Satiren und Pasquillen aus der Reformationszeit* (3 vols., Hannover, 1856, 1858).

mayer, the gunsmith Georg Motschidler, and the woman Argula von Stauff (von Grumbach).

To give a general indication of the great increase in writing during the Reformation, it may be noted that while in 1518 there were 150 works published in German, the number increased to 260 in 1519, 570 in 1520, 620 in 1521, 680 in 1522, 935 in 1523 and 990 in 1524. After 1524 the output of the presses began to ebb, a clear indication of the break between the religious reformers and the common man. The Protestant churches in Germany were henceforth built up by the princes and theologians and popular response was no longer the determining factor.

Of about fifty cities in Germany which were publishing books during the Reformation, Wittenberg, previously an unimportant place, was the foremost with the remarkable record of 600 different works printed during the years from 1518 to 1523.

This vast output was almost exclusively Lutheran literature. Scholars complained that the whole book market was devoted to books by Luther and his followers and that nobody wished to print anything for the pope or any material which would offend Luther. Erasmus wrote in 1523 to King Henry VIII of England, "Here in Basle who would dare to let even one little word be printed against Luther, while one is allowed to write against the Pope what one likes," and on the 21st of June, 1524, he wrote further, "Among the Germans it is hardly possible to sell anything except Luther's writings and those of his adversaries." Catholic polemics and authors had a difficult time finding printers and publishers for their manuscripts. Hieronymus Emser noted in 1521 that he had to print his writings against Luther at his own cost. Georg Witzel from Mainz, a Catholic convert from Lutheranism, complained that the printer had kept his manuscript for a whole year with promises. "If I would write as a Lutheran," he said, "there would be no difficulty, but as a Catholic I am writing in vain."<sup>11</sup>

It is clear that the market for printed works had changed. No longer was it the church, the school, and the scholars who

11 "Johann Cochlaeus, 27 Briefe," ed. by Friedensburg, W., in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1897/98, XVIII; see also Herte, A., *Die Lutherkommentare des Joh. Cochlaeus* (Münster, 1935), 24.

absorbed the output. On the contrary, church and scholars could hardly get their works printed. The vastly increased output went to new groups and far wider ones, which were interested in a simple, direct message in the Lutheran line.

A forceful illustration of the change is given by the experience of two well established printers of the pre-Reformation time who failed to respond to the changing conditions. Anton Koberger, who is said to have had twenty-four printing presses and 100 journeymen at the peak of his success, lost his printing business and kept only the publishing.<sup>12</sup> A similar experience was suffered by Johann Froben of Basle who also kept to the old tradition of printing books in large folios and found no market for them. The old aristocratic business had changed into a more plebeian and popular industry.

It may be asked why the printers shifted so quickly from the Catholic works to the Lutheran. Were they merely following the demand? Were they directed by the desire for profit? Most of the evidence points in this direction. In the *Table Talks* Luther quoted his printer, Grunenberg, as saying that M. Lotther made 100 and 200 per cent profit on Luther's writings. Eberlin von Günzburg complained about the profit-making attitude of the printers. He wrote a very entertaining pamphlet *Mich Wundert, dass Kein Geld im Lande ist*, which was printed twice in 1524.<sup>13</sup> It contained a trenchant criticism of existing conditions, supposedly by three journeymen. They maintain that the book printers are influenced only by the economic laws of supply and demand. They print everything good or evil. Now they print Luther's writings and the Bible but only to make profits. "So God's words must also serve the idolatrous greed of the printers," they say. "But God will not laugh long at that. He will not spare the profit-making printer." Luther himself complained several times about the "greed" of the printers. "I shall forward no more material," he wrote from the Wartburg in August 15, 1521 to Georg Spalatin at Altenberg, "until I learn that these sordid mercenaries care less for their profits than for the public. Such printers seem to think: It is enough for me to get the money,

12 "Johann Neudörffer," ed. by Loshner, G. W. K., (Wien, 1875, *Quellenschriften für Kunstgeschichte*, X); and *Nachrichten von den vornehmsten Künstlern*, ed. by Campe, F., (Nürnberg, 1928). Neudörffer was a younger contemporary of A. Koberger.

13 Enders, L., *von Günzburg*, III, 147-184.

let the reader look out for the matter."<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, it is also likely that the printers themselves had Lutheran sympathies and preferred to print Lutheran material. They were from the burgher class which provided the leading Lutherans. This view is borne out by a letter of Johann Cochlaeus written on September 27, 1521 to the papal Nuncio Hieronymus Aleander, in which he complains, "Nearly all printers are secret Lutherans, they do not print anything for us without pay and nothing reliable unless we stand beside them and look over their shoulders." Aleander wrote in the margin: "*Nihil novi adfers.*"

The attempt was made to suppress the Lutheran literature. The Edict of Worms in 1521 ordered that Lutheran books should be burned and that no other books should be printed without the permission of the authorities. But before 1524 two factors operated to make the decree ineffective. The first was that the local officials in states and cities who would have had to enforce the edict were on the whole reluctant to do so, partly because of their own sympathies and partly because it would have run counter to the powerful economic interests of the printers. The second was that the rapid production and widespread distribution of material created a situation for which the authorities were unprepared. Even after the officials were forced to attempt to carry out the censorship edict, it was made ineffective in general by illicit printing and the secret trade in forbidden prints by the hawkers. Printing had become an economic interest of such importance that every effort was made by the interested parties to prevent its ruin and an already affected public opinion tried to restrain its limitation.

The response to the new literature has already been indicated by reference to the sales and to the opposition to censorship. The effect of a message upon a people can never be measured in exact terms. Nor even if we could count the number of professed Lutherans would we be closer to an exact determination of the reason for this change. Certain general aspects of the effect of printing on the spread of the Reformation may, however, profitably be considered.

The first of these points is concerned with those who read the Lutheran writings. It is important to note that there was a broader education among the people than is usually

14 Reprinted in Smith, P., *The Life and Letters of Martin Luther*, (New York, 1911) 124.

suggested. The "Brethren of the Common Life" had founded teaching and educational institutions. In addition there was the teaching of other humanists, while monastery and cathedral schools as well as city institutions existed throughout practically all of Germany. From 1456 to 1506 nine new universities had been founded in Germany. Besides there were people who taught only reading and writing. In addition, for those who could not read, there were those who read to the people—the predicants, the scribes, and the reading women. Thus it can be said that a large percentage of the German burghers could read before the Reformation and that there were readers to supply the wants of the unlettered.

Contemporary evidence indicates that the burghers bought many books and read them. Cochlaeus wrote that the whole world read the Lutheran New Testament. A large group knew it by heart after repeated readings. Even the shoemakers and women talked about the gospel and carried the translation about with them. In 1522 the magistrate and the burghers of Bremen sent a bookseller to Wittenberg in order to buy Luther's writings. The burghers of Speyer liked to read Luther's books during supper time and copied them at night. The Nuremberg people listened to the reading of Luther's writings on the open market.

It might be argued that at the beginning a part of this success was due to curiosity and desire for sensation; that people read merely because they wished to know more of the monk who made a stand against indulgences and was being prosecuted for heresy by the papal court. If so, this stimulus would not have lasted long, for the greater part of Luther's writings would quickly have disappointed the curious, because they had no sensational tenor. The best evidence that desire for sensation was not the motive animating most of those who read or heard Luther's works is that the demand continually increased.

It is clear that the message of the Reformation was spread chiefly by two means, by preaching and by printing. That little has been said of the former is only because this paper is principally concerned with the interaction of printing and the Reformation. Preaching was a vitally important, and some have held, the most important instrument for the spread of Lutheran



ideas. Luther's contributions to it of simplicity and effectiveness are not less significant than to writing.

The general movement among the clergy was led by the monks of Luther's order, the Augustines, such as John Lang of Erfurt, Kaspar Güttel of Mainz, and the Netherland Augustine monks who died as martyrs for their convictions, and included also Franciscan friars like Heinrich of Kettenbach and Eberlin of Günzburg, Dominicans like Martin Butzer, and from the order of Premonstratensians, Johann Bugenhagen, the apostle of Pomerania. It was seconded by all ranks of the secular priesthood who were joined by the patrician provosts of the great towns. There were also many evangelists and upholders from the laity, particularly from the sedentary crafts like the weavers, furriers, and shoemakers. There were even a very few preachers from the peasant class. But in contrast to earlier religious movements in which preaching could be supported only by manuscripts, laboriously copied, the Reformation preachers had the aid of the printers in supplementing their words with printed matter. The literature prepared the way for the work, followed it up, and gave to the preachers themselves a steady stream of fresh ideas and arguments.<sup>15</sup>

Luther signalized the contribution of printing, when he spoke of it as "an unquenchable flame" and "the last and highest gift of God for the Gospel." In a sermon of March 10, 1522, he declared, "I have only put in motion God's word through preaching and writing. The word has done everything and carried everything before it." One may even quote his rather proud though justified comment, "Look at my work: have I not alone broken off more from the pope, bishops, priests, and monks, with my words, than up to now all emperors, kings, and princes could do with all their forces."

The two great forces for the spread of the new doctrine were preaching and the press. Only the latter could win for a new idea thousands, indeed hundreds of thousands of people at the same moment. It is the great contribution of printing that it made the Reformation a sacred cause of the whole people.

<sup>15</sup> An interesting light is thrown upon this by the pamphlet *Klage der sieben frommen Pfaffen*, by Johann Eberlin von Günzburg, ed. by Enders, L., von Günzburg, II, 57-93.

## SOME PROTESTANT ATTITUDES ON THE LABOR QUESTION IN 1886

CARL WARREN GRIFFITHS  
*Chicago, Illinois*

An important development in 1886 was the interest which the religious forces of the country showed in the problem of capital and labor. It was an interest that was not confined to a few socially minded religious leaders. The religious press, the pulpit and church gatherings showed a deep concern in the relations of workingmen with their employers. It was a natural concern because it was a year of labor unrest that was symbolized in the public mind by the phenomenal growth of the Knights of Labor and by numerous strikes and boycotts.<sup>1</sup>

Some editors of religious papers were glad to see this display of interest and hoped that it would lead to a solution of the labor problem through methods of arbitration and co-operation.<sup>2</sup> *Zion's Herald* believed that the labor question was becoming more and more threatening and thought that its solution would come in part through the application of Christian justice and benevolence.<sup>3</sup> The editor of the *Churchman* declared that the sermons preached on the labor problem had shown that the spirit of Christian socialism was widespread in the church, and stated with pride that the secular press was amazed at the wisdom shown in the pulpits and in religious journals. The times had called for an outspoken development of a Christ-like love for the brethren, and the church had shown itself equal to the occasion.<sup>4</sup> The *Christian Advocate*, speaking from the quantitative standpoint, declared that

<sup>1</sup> For a survey of the nature and extent of labor troubles see "Report of the Secretary of the Interior: Being Part of the Message and Documents Communicated to the Two Houses of Congress at the Beginning of the First Session of the Fiftieth Congress," *House Executive Document*, No. 1, Part 5, Vol. v, 50 Congress, 1 Session (Washington, 1887); and "Investigation of Labor Troubles in Missouri, Arkansas, Kansas, Texas, and Illinois," *House Report*, No. 4174, 49 Congress, 2 Session (Washington, 1887).

<sup>2</sup> *Northwestern Christian Advocate* (Chicago), December 1, 1886; *Central Christian Advocate* (St. Louis), February 24, 1886.

<sup>3</sup> *Zion's Herald* (Boston), March 17, 1886.

<sup>4</sup> *Churchman* (New York), June 26, 1886.

within a "comparatively short time" it had published thirty-four articles on the problem of capital and labor.<sup>5</sup>

It was a period when many churchmen were worried for fear that the church was losing its hold upon the masses. Thus, the Chicago Presbytery showed concern over the need of evangelization "in our destitute population, especially as massed in our large cities." It urged, therefore, that the General Assembly of the church, without lowering the educational standards for the ministry, should devise a plan for "laborers of less complete and elaborate culture to meet the present and increasingly imperative need of these exceptional populations."<sup>6</sup> In similar spirit the Inter-Denominational Congress in the Interest of City Evangelization met in Cincinnati in December, 1885, and discussed socialism, evangelistic work in the cities, Christian work for the foreign born and similar topics. At this meeting Washington Gladden spoke on "Church Neglect as Caused by the Strife Between Labor and Capital," while Richard T. Ely read a paper on "Socialism." Mr. Gladden emphasized in particular the fear that the church was losing the workingman. As an example he cited his church. He believed that laboring men comprised about one fourth of the population of the country, but revealed that his church, which had free pews and a democratic spirit, had in the congregation only about ten per cent who were workingmen.<sup>7</sup>

In 1886 Baptist leaders met for their fifth annual Congress for the Discussion of Current Questions. At the evening session of November 16 the Rev. P. S. Moxom of Boston and the Hon. James Buchanan of Trenton, N. J., read papers on the labor question. Mr. Moxom announced his belief that the spirit of *laissez-faire* was "heartless and selfish." He thought that the discontent of the laborers was sometimes selfish, but that it was also prophetic. The surprising thing was that the awakening of the laborers had been so conservative and so little disposed to violent and revolutionary action.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *Christian Advocate* (New York), February 18, 1886.

<sup>6</sup> Annual Meeting, Second Day, April 13, 1886, in the Sixth Presbyterian Church, *Record of Chicago Presbytery* (MS), IV, 111-112.

<sup>7</sup> *Discussions of the Inter-Denominational Congress in the Interest of City Evangelization, Held in Cincinnati, December 7-11, 1885* (Cincinnati, 1886), 124-137.

<sup>8</sup> *Fifth Annual Session of the Baptist Congress for the Discussion of Current Questions, Held at the Eutaw Place Baptist Church, Baltimore, Md., November 16th, 17th and 18th, 1886* (New York, 1887), 43-48.

At the same session of the Congress the Rev. G. T. Dowling of Cleveland declared that "the leaguering together of the working men is one of the most hopeful signs of our times." He qualified his praise of unions, however, by announcing that they must learn that their chief end was not to strike. He foresaw the day when the wage system might be replaced by some form of industrial partnership.<sup>9</sup>

Often the sentiment at such meetings of religious leaders was unfriendly to labor unions.<sup>10</sup> But the general interest in the question of capital and labor was clear. Thus, at the fiftieth anniversary of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, on May 11, 1886, President Hitchcock read before the alumni association a paper on Christian Socialism.<sup>11</sup> At the commencement of the Yale Divinity School in the same year the theme was "The Relation of the Ministry to Socialism,"<sup>12</sup> while on March 30 and 31, 1886, Dr. Behrends gave lectures at Hartford Seminary on the subject of the rights of labor and the responsibilities of wealth.<sup>13</sup> In Chicago the Presbyterian Social Union held forums on the labor problem,<sup>14</sup> while at a meeting of Baptist ministers in the same city George A. Schilling and other labor leaders were invited to present the workers' side of the labor question.<sup>15</sup> On May 26, moreover, the delegates at the American Congress of Churches, meeting in Cleveland, heard addresses on the subject, "The Workingmen's Distrust of the Church; Its Causes and Remedies." Henry George and John Jarrett, a Pittsburgh labor leader, were among the speakers.<sup>16</sup>

This interest of churchmen in the workingman was not lost upon the labor press. *The Journal of United Labor*, al-

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 55.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 59; *Inter-Denominational Congress 1885*, 8-15. See also the paper of William E. Weeden on "Arbitration and Its Relation to Strikes," *Official Report of the Twelfth Meeting of the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches, Held at Saratoga, N. Y., September 20-24, 1886* (New York, 1886), 134-135.

<sup>11</sup> *New York Daily Tribune*, May 12, 1886; *Standard* (Chicago), May 20, 1886.

<sup>12</sup> H. F. Farnam, "The Clergy and the Labor Question," in *New Princeton Review*, II, 48 (July, 1886). Mr. Farnam feared that an interest in the workers, particularly when "reinforced by strong sympathies," had its pitfalls. He thought that too many clergymen and too many religious papers denounced the industrial system, advocated profit-sharing as the laborer's due, and said that monarchy in industry and democracy in politics were incompatible.

<sup>13</sup> *Congregationalist* (Boston), April 15, 1886.

<sup>14</sup> *Interior* (Chicago), March 18, 1886.

<sup>15</sup> *Our Country* (New York), April 17, 1886.

<sup>16</sup> *Christian Union* (New York), June 3, 1886; *New York Tribune*, May 25, 1886.

though not openly hostile to organized religion, had its cynical moments, and declared on May 25, 1886, that the labor question was "proving to be a mine of wealth to the pulpit, which has now struck the vein and is working it for 'all it is worth.'" The labor problem, in other words, had become the fashion. The editor stated, however, that the church's interest in this question had come too late "to inspire us with great faith in its genuineness." He was glad, nevertheless, to see the ministers repeat "what we workingmen reiterated twenty years ago." The pulpit, in other words, gave some signs that it was learning.<sup>17</sup>

Another influential labor journal, *John Swinton's Paper*, also found occasion to criticize certain clergymen for their views on labor. In particular, this paper took pains to heap ridicule on "Bread-and-Water-Beecher" and his reactionary sermons.<sup>18</sup> It also cited a labor discussion among members of the Congregational Club of New York City, and declared that the general conclusion of the discussion seemed to be that the solution of the labor problem depended upon the conversion of the rich employers. The editor commented that in such a case the problem would not be solved until Gabriel blew his horn.<sup>19</sup> Like the *Journal of United Labor*, however, *John Swinton's Paper* praised ministers whom it thought to be friends of the workingman, and on November 14, 1886, congratulated three clergymen upon their election to Congress. Each of these men was friendly to labor. Unfortunately, however, the Rev. Jesse Jones, who was a Master Workman of the Knights of Labor, had failed of election.<sup>20</sup>

In recognition of clerical interest in the problems of the workingman many labor papers reprinted sermons and addresses which showed sympathy for the worker.<sup>21</sup> *The Laborer*, moreover, quoted a letter which the Rev. E. Fales of Palestine, Texas, had sent to the *Congregationalist*. Mr. Fales wrote in defense of the Knights of Labor who were then striking against

17 *The Journal of United Labor* (Philadelphia), May 25, 1886. This paper reflected the views of the Knights of Labor.

18 *John Swinton's Paper* (New York), June 13, 1886.

19 *Ibid.*, May 23, 1886.

20 *Ibid.*, November 14, 1886.

21 *The Laborer* (Haverhill, Marlboro and Brockton, Mass.), May 15, 1886; *Knights of Labor* (Chicago), May 22, November 20, 1886; *Weekly Labor Bulletin* (Decatur, Ill.), April 22, September 30, 1886; *Workman* (Cleveland), May 1, 8, 22, 1886.



the Gould system of railroads in the southwest. Mr. Fales declared that the railroads paid the workers poorly, that saloon keepers had no use for members of the Knights of Labor, and that the Knights were not guilty of disorderly conduct. In fact, although hundreds of deputies were present, there had been no disorder. Mr. Fales added that his Sunday School superintendent, one deacon and one trustee were members of the Knights of Labor.<sup>22</sup>

Under the caption "A Reverend Striker," the *Knights of Labor* announced that the Rev. John Johnson of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Monongahela City, Pa., was in the Allegheny County workhouse for eight months for rioting and inciting to riot. Mr. Johnson had preached to the people near Coal Center, had then worked in the mines and had joined a strike in the fall of 1885. The miners liked him, and made him their spokesman during the strike. He was now in jail for his part in helping to keep "blacklegs" from working abandoned mines.<sup>23</sup>

Often critical and sometimes appreciative of the clergy's interest in unions, strikes, and boycotts, the labor press reflected the concern which religious leaders were showing in the problems of capital and labor.

The many strikes in 1886 and the rapid growth of the Knights of Labor focused attention upon the strike as a means of redressing grievances and upon the desirability of having a powerful union as the spokesman for labor. And to these questions the religious press gave much attention. On the surface the religious press showed a surprising friendliness for the Knights of Labor and for Terence V. Powderly, the Grand Master Workman of the Order. Yet the value of this sympathy for the Knights of Labor was qualified by criticism of the methods by which this organization tried to improve the conditions of the workingmen. The religious journals, on the whole, accepted the right of laborers to organize, but condemned the use of the strike or boycott. In particular, they condemned attempts by labor unions to interfere with the "freedom of contract" of those workers who did not wish to join labor organizations nor to strike.

<sup>22</sup> *Laborer*, April 24, 1886.

<sup>23</sup> *Knights of Labor*, July 17, 1886.



The *Christian Advocate* stated that each worker had a right to choose to whom he would apply for work, and the right to accept or to reject the wages offered. The worker might ask for better wages and had the right to quit if the raise in wages were not granted. Workers, moreover, had the right to organize for "instruction, mutual interest and helpfulness, or for any other purpose," and had the privilege of persuading others to join their organization. But workers also had the right to refuse to join such organizations.<sup>24</sup> In common with many religious journals the *Christian Advocate* thought strikes to be folly. It announced its sympathy for the workingmen who were the "bone and sinew" of the country as well as of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but declared at the same time its feeling for the employers, most of whom had raised themselves to high position through industry, thrift, and temperate habits.<sup>25</sup>

The *Northwestern Christian Advocate* argued that laborers were forced to organize in order to combat effectively the combinations which employers had formed. The railroads, coal producers, iron and steel manufacturers, and other employers had combined to "obstruct competition and preserve prices from being reduced by the natural laws of production and distribution." The workingman had as good a right to organize in order to "neutralize as far as possible the injurious effects of capital combination." In fact, the workingman should organize: "There is more hope in the outcome than to leave mutual association all on the side of the employers."<sup>26</sup> In like spirit, the *Advance* stated that "In order to avoid being forced to accept terms dictated by the cupidity of employers, laborers found it necessary to organize."<sup>27</sup>

The *Northwestern Christian Advocate* was somewhat more tolerant than other religious journals in its attitude toward strikes. Commenting that strikers were doing a brisk business, it announced that the victories of the cab-drivers and some other strikers had the approval of the public. People realized that strikes could not succeed without some coercion,

<sup>24</sup> *Christian Advocate* (New York), April 29, 1886. This was a Methodist publication.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, June 17, 1886.

<sup>26</sup> *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, March 31, 1886. This was a Methodist paper.

<sup>27</sup> *Advance* (Chicago), June 3, 1886. This was a Congregationalist paper.

and so long as it was the street car companies that were involved the public did not seem to mind a certain amount of lawlessness. This paper warned, however, that violence should be taken only in small amounts. Strikes and boycotts were dangerous to the cause of labor because they were likely in the end to alienate public opinion.<sup>28</sup> The *Advance* joined in warning labor that strikes were harmful, and declared that the denial to non-union men of the right to work was wrong.<sup>29</sup>

One editor declared that he believed thoroughly in labor unions, announced that organizations of working men could do much good if conducted upon just principles, yet stated that many unions were characterized by despotism.<sup>30</sup> The *Christian Oracle* agreed that labor had the right to organize but condemned the coercion of non-union members. This paper criticized strikes and declared that men should be free to work if they cared to do so.<sup>31</sup> In similar spirit the *Christian Evangelist* affirmed that organized labor became a "despotic monopoly" when it proscribed work for men who were not members of unions.<sup>32</sup>

The *Churchman* made a flank attack by expressing its sympathy for the prison laborers who suffered because labor unions had ordered a boycott upon prison made goods. This demand that the prisoner should not work was an illustration of the "cruel savagery and selfishness of socialism." In even more cynical spirit this paper announced that the Knights of Labor had taught the clergy a valuable lesson. The Knights, through their declaration that they were ready to forward one hundred thousand dollars to support a strike, had taught that no member of their organization could, without "absolute impertinence," pretend to be dependent upon charity. The church, therefore, could "rule them out" of its charitable work.<sup>33</sup>

Occasionally a religious paper expressed the belief that

28 *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, March 24, 1886.

29 *Advance*, June 3, 1886.

30 *Christian Register* (Boston), May 20, 1886. See also, March 11, 1886. This paper was Unitarian.

31 *Christian Oracle* (Des Moines, Iowa), April 15, 1886. This was a Disciples of Christ paper.

32 *Christian Evangelist* (St. Louis), February 25, 1886. This was a Disciples of Christ paper.

33 *Churchman* (New York), May 1, 1886. For support of this idea, see the *Living Church* (Chicago), May 8, 1886. Both of these papers were Protestant Episcopal.

the workingman could best "work out his own salvation" without the help of labor organizations.<sup>34</sup> The general attitude of the religious press, however, was that labor unions might be useful, but that they were damaging their cause and injuring the "free laborer" through coercion in strikes and boycotts.<sup>35</sup>

The religious papers often criticized local and district leaders of the Knights of Labor, particularly when those leaders used the strike or the boycott to gain their ends. Yet the religious press was largely agreed in its approval of Terence V. Powderly, Grand Master Workman of the Knights of Labor. The consensus of these journals was that Powderly was a conservative leader under whose guidance the Knights might follow a moderate, non-violent course of action. Powderly, for example, had declared that with proper organization "aided by a powerful conservative labor press, there [was] nothing in reason" that labor could not have. Strikes, lock-outs, and boycotts would become a thing of the past if labor would learn "coolly and deliberately [to] weigh every question as it should be weighed."<sup>36</sup>

The *Western Christian Advocate* believed that conditions would be all right if the Knights followed Powderly's advice. But the Grand Master Workman, unfortunately, did not seem to exercise control over many of the local assemblies of the Knights.<sup>37</sup> The *Christian Leader* thought Powderly to be a man of ability and practical foresight. He was handicapped, however, because many local officers in the Knights of Labor were undisciplined and given to precipitate action.<sup>38</sup> The *Independent*, in its turn, announced its belief that Powderly was a moderate, sensible leader, but that his "satraps" were foolish and domineering.<sup>39</sup> In similar spirit, other religious journals described Powderly as a responsible leader who was

34 *Zion's Herald*, May 5, 1886.

35 *Herald and Presbyter* (Cincinnati), April 7, May 12, 1886; *Standard* (Chicago), March 18, 1886; *Pittsburgh Christian Advocate* (Pittsburgh), April 1, May 6, 1886; *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), March 24, June 16, 1886; *Christian Advocate* (New York), May 20, 1886; *United Presbyterian* (Pittsburgh), March 25, April 22, 1886; *Presbyterian Banner* (Pittsburgh), March 17, May 19, 1886; *Congregationalist*, April 1, 1886; *Interior*, April 15, 1886; *Christian Leader* (Boston), April 15, 1886; *Christian Register*, March 11, 1886.

36 *Journal of United Labor*, February 25, 1886.

37 *Western Christian Advocate*, May 26, 1886.

38 *Christian Leader*, April 1, 1886.

39 *Independent*, March 25, 1886.

handicapped by turbulent and hotheaded men among the ranks of lesser officials.<sup>40</sup>

Powderly commended himself particularly to the editors of religious journals because of his condemnation of liquor. Both Powderly and the *Journal of United Labor* were zealous in advocating temperance among workingmen. The *Journal*, for example, quoted approvingly a plea that the laborers should "Leave Whiskey Alone," and that they should follow the example of the sainted founder of the Knights, Uriah S. Stephens. Workers should leave whiskey drinking to "rich drones and idlers."<sup>41</sup> Powderly, moreover, made more stringent the rule forbidding liquor dealers to join the Knights, and declared that if a member's wife sold liquor he should divorce her or the organization. Recognizing that some organizers for the Knights were accused of excessive drinking, he declared that he could "assure the man who drinks that he never will represent the present Grand Master Workman except when sober." In his choice of organizers, moreover, Powderly required affirmative answer to the question: "Will you carefully exclude lawyers, bankers, gamblers, loafers, professional politicians and rumsellers of all grades, from the meeting before you organize an Assembly, and caution them against the admission of all such persons. . .?"<sup>42</sup>

Consequently, the *Advance* declared that Powderly and some other leaders of the Knights were "wise and honest" in their purpose, and praised the Grand Master Workman for his counselling the Knights to be moderate in the matter of strikes, and for his renouncing the boycott, except that against strong drink.<sup>43</sup> The *Independent* printed Frances Willard's article on "A Christian Woman's View of the Labor Movement" in which she praised Powderly and his lieutenants for taking the vows of total abstinence. She stated, moreover, that the Knights, in asking for women equal pay for equal work, were showing themselves to be "Knights of the new chivalry."<sup>44</sup> The *Standard* added its voice to those approving

40 *Interior*, April 8, 1886; *Christian Evangelist*, April 22, 1886; *Central Christian Advocate*, April 14, 1886; *Pittsburgh Christian Advocate*, April 1, 1886; *Advance*, May 13, 1886.

41 *Journal of United Labor*, December 25, 1886.

42 *Journal of United Labor*, February 10, 1886.

43 *Advance*, May 13, 1886.

44 *Independent*, December 23, 1886.

Powderly, and described him as a "public benefactor" who was using his influence with laborers to develop correct habits of living which promised to secure more for them than strikes or boycotts.<sup>45</sup> And the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* praised the Knights for their stand on the liquor question, adding that if all members of the order were temperate they would seldom have to strike, and if they did strike, would usually win.<sup>46</sup> No friend of labor unions, *Zion's Herald* declared that the laborer, by living in ignorance and vice, was his own oppressor and had in his own hands the power to better his condition far more than he could through joining unions and getting wage increases. Wage increases, in other words, would not be needed if workers stopped spending their money for drink, or if housewives read cook books and household guides instead of sensational stories.<sup>47</sup>

Years later Powderly wrote that many leading prohibitionists in the years around 1886 sought his influence to further their cause. But he soon decided that "a more detestable set of hypocrites did not exist." Their argument, he discovered, was that men could afford to work for lower pay if they did not spend so much money for drink.<sup>48</sup> Powderly, however, had high praise for Frances Willard and believed that the saloon was one of the worst enemies of the workingman.<sup>49</sup>

In spite of occasional friendliness the forces of organized religion and labor looked on each other with suspicion. Laboring men sometimes expressed their aspirations in religious phraseology. Thus, one wrote: "Our father, who sits in Scranton, Pa., T. V. Powderly is thy name, may thy principles of justice rule and govern this government . . . Lead us not in the way of monopoly, but deliver us from the Republican and Democratic parties, and thine shall be power and the glory and honor, Amen."<sup>50</sup> In similar spirit a member of the Knights spoke of God as the "great Master Workman of this Universe."<sup>51</sup> Labor, however, showed no expectancy of receiving

45 *Standard*, May 20, 1886.

46 *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, April 14, 1886.

47 *Zion's Herald*, January 13, 1886.

48 *The Path I Trod: the Autobiography of Terence V. Powderly*, ed. by Harry J. Carman, Henry David and Paul N. Guthrie (New York, 1940), 190.

49 *Ibid.*, 388-389; 364.

50 *Journal of United Labor*, September 25, 1886.

51 *Ibid.*, July 10, 1885.

much support from organized religion in its struggle to better the position of the workingman.

Religious leaders, in their turn, particularly as they expressed themselves through the religious press, were friendly to labor only within limits. They commended the Knights of Labor and T. V. Powderly chiefly because they saw here hopes for a conservative labor movement which would subdue alike the demons of rum and of violence.



## BOOK REVIEWS

### THE NATURE OF THE EARLY CHURCH

By ERNEST F. SCOTT. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941. vii, 245 pages. \$2.00.

Dr. Scott does more than the title implies, for he strongly suggests that through all its differences the Christian Church has held at its heart the essence of the movement in its first days: namely, the assertion of the reality of a higher spiritual world and of the wisdom and duty of men to live for and in that world. In these pages he discusses the significance of the primitive church, its relation to the message of Jesus, the importance of the very early days of the movement, its worship, organization, the place which teaching held in its activities, Paul's idea of the church, its ethical task, and its relation to the state. To each of these a chapter is devoted.

The author sees the early church as the community of the kingdom; that is, a community of faith and hope—faith in Jesus as the Messiah and hope of the imminent coming of the new order, the Kingdom of God. With this was joined the endeavor to live even now as they would live in the future glorious age. This idea of the church as essentially a fellowship rather than an institution is historically correct and its perception is by no means without important values for our torn and divided world. The absolute character of the ethics of Jesus and his early followers finds its explanation in the confidence that this world was soon to pass and a world where God's will is utterly done would take its place. In dealing with this phase of the matter, Dr. Scott does excellent work. The failure of their Messiah to return and inaugurate the Kingdom had important bearing on the change from an expectant fellowship to an organization, although the author rightly insists that the idea of fellowship persisted. The enthusiastic, hopeful followers of Jesus gradually perceived that they must go on living in this world and the movement had thus to adapt itself to that which it had believed would soon pass away. This adaptation with its many and important phases is presented with learning and with frequent brilliant insights. No brief review can do justice to the carefully wrought argument. The volume should be read to be appreciated and it should be read widely.

There is so much in the book for which readers will be grateful to the author for its fine expression that it would be easy to pass by some matters that might be questioned. Dr. Scott emphasizes the unique-

ness of the message and religion and ethics of Jesus to a degree that some will think not quite justified. There is a corresponding "playing down" of the influence of inheritance and environment on both Jesus and his early followers. At times he is intolerant of any emphasis on "life situations." But at other times he has to admit their effect. There is also a tendency to pass by too easily some very difficult and important problems as, for example, the difference between the messianic hope of the disciples while Jesus was alive and that which followed the resurrection faith. Possibly their consideration would have lengthened the work unduly, but they merit consideration. The book raises some questions which the author has not answered; but it is, nevertheless, a healthy and valuable contribution to our literature on the church.

The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School.

Ernest W. Parsons.

### CHRISTIAN TRUTH IN HISTORY

By HUGH MILLER. New York: Harper and Brothers. xx, 236 pages. \$2.50.

Professor Miller is bold enough to maintain as a philosopher what theologians sometimes hesitate to say out loud—that Christianity is an important factor in history, and that one's philosophy should take account of the fact. The significant history of human society is its religious history, and the climax of human development is

the movement first to the establishment of Christianity in the ancient world, and then through institutional or ecclesiastical religion to the free Christianity of the modern period (p. 43).

Dr. Miller deals with the place of religion in man's interpretation of the world (the book looks as if it came out of courses on philosophy of religion, though I hope it will reach the general as well as the academic public), and finds Christianity both adequate to that function and central in human history. His brief and suggestive survey of church history sees the effort towards a Christian society as the particular contribution of the present period. Democratic Christianity is central in our own history as the religious inspiration of the "American dream." And Dr. Miller hopes that a still more universal Christianity will play its part in the struggles of today and tomorrow. I do not wish to parade minor disagreements with Dr. Miller's history, or to criticize his philosophy here—some will agree with his empirical realism, others will wish that it were more realistic and less empirical, and hope that he may come to use words like "incarnation," "divinity," "resurrection," and "truth" not only with his present enthusiasm for what they represent, but with more acceptance of what they usually mean. It is more important here to note that his book is stimulating and valuable, and a fine piece of unifying thought. Dr. Miller sees history in the light of philosophy, Christianity as closely related to both, and all three as of direct significance for the problems of modern life.

General Theological Seminary.

E. R. Hardy, Jr.

## FRANCIS OF ASSISI, APOSTLE OF POVERTY

By RAY C. PETRY. Durham: Duke University Press, 1941. 199 pages. \$3.00.

Professor Petry's book is a most worthy addition to the literature on St. Francis. It shows a thorough and competent mastery of the vast material, both primary and secondary, which has gathered about this most popular of saints. But his real achievement in this book is a spiritual understanding of the heart of the Poverello's adventure. He has sought with "scholarly comprehensiveness . . . to interpret the full significance which he [Francis] attached to poverty." This aim is adequately fulfilled. It is "poverty of spirit," not simply poverty of the body, which is fundamental to his genius and the permanent value and significance of his life. Francis was an idealist, a prophet and mystic, and not a reformer or revolutionist; his contribution is "a fecund idealism which advanced human happiness irrespective of environmental limitations"; his achievements, "the products of moral suasion exercised by a man of catholic spirit and pacific soul."

We are led by Professor Petry to see Francis' ideal of poverty not only in his personal asceticism and the community life of his brothers, but in his mysticism, his eschatological preaching, his Biblical and sacramental piety, and above all in his loyalty to the ecclesiastical institution. Stress is laid on his submission to the authority of the Church as an aspect of his poverty; for Francis never doubted that the Church would protect his friars by virtue of the fact that poverty was part of that saving gospel which the Church was committed to teach and preserve. As to the stigmata, Professor Petry is cautious. Whatever the "discernible mark," Francis did achieve "creative identification" and community with Christ's suffering which impressed his followers; "but a spiritual metamorphosis of the human soul greater than any physical accompaniment which may have attended it."

Criticism is made of Francis' extreme mortification of the body and his self-depreciation; and also of that absolute devotion to poverty which made virtue of ignorance. But the chief difficulty with his uncompromising discipline was that he failed "to make his ideal accessible to the men in whom he had aroused a longing for the power which attends renunciation." The reason was that an ideal evolved for individual needs could not be applied to group life without a reorganization of the social order—a task which Francis was either unwilling to assume or too naive to perceive.

This book will certainly become "required reading" for any who would understand the Apostle of Poverty.

Episcopal Theological School,  
Cambridge, Mass.

Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.

## BENJAMIN FURLY AND QUAKERISM IN ROTTERDAM

By WILLIAM I. HULL. Swarthmore, Pa.: Swarthmore College Monographs on Quaker History, Number Five, 1941. xvi, 314 pages. \$3.50.

Although the author of this scholarly biography died two years before its date of publication, some of his devoted friends (notably Professor Henry J. Cadbury of Harvard University and Dr. Thomas K. Brown, editor of *Bulletin of Friends' Historical Association*) adequately and carefully edited his manuscript. Professor Hull was for forty-seven years an active member of Swarthmore's faculty. From 1929 to 1939 he filled the Howard M. Jenkins chair of Quaker History and Research, which enabled him to devote nearly all his energies to the study of Quakerism in the Dutch Republic. He published four volumes dealing with this interesting subject, and left five volumes in manuscript form, including the work now under discussion.

Benjamin Furdy (1636-1714) was the son of a devout Quaker who suffered three years of imprisonment for his faith until the Great Plague of 1665 removed all of the gaolers; he was set free "and was never more called for." Benjamin gladly availed himself of the relative degree of religious toleration which at that time prevailed in Holland. Like so many other English Protestants, he first went to Amsterdam, which the author appropriately calls "the home of many languages." Here he assisted George Fox in his linguistic labors to prove that the Quakers were fully justified in the use of "thou." Shortly after his removal to Rotterdam he became the leader of the local group of Quakers. He wrote numerous pamphlets in defense of his religion, and he also reprinted some of the earlier Quaker literature that had appeared in the Netherlands. For about thirty years the meetings of the Friends in Rotterdam were held in his own home. He was for a time the chief agent of William Penn on the Continent, advertising among Germans and Hollanders the advantages of Pennsylvania. Like Penn, he fought a great battle for democracy and religious toleration.

This biography of Furdy is a valuable source of information for students of English, American, and Dutch history. It is based upon the study of many original sources; the documentation is profuse, and the organization of the subject-matter leaves nothing to be desired. Perhaps the collection of so many details made it difficult for the author to remember always some of the more important facts in European history. He mentions William III, but calls him the son-in-law of King Charles II, instead of James II (p. 59). He also errs when he says that in 1675 England was in alliance with Louis XIV in the war against Holland (p. 242).

University of Michigan.

Albert Hyma.

## THE STORY OF THE MENNONITES

By C. HENRY SMITH, Berne, Ind.: Mennonite Book Concern. 1941.  
823 pages, ill. \$2.50.

To recommend a really good book is always a pleasure for the reviewer, and this one keeps the reader in its spell throughout its eight hundred pages. C. Henry Smith is no stranger to American church history scholars, and a respectable series of scholarly books has made him the foremost authority in Mennonite history. The present book is the successful conclusion of his life-work and therefore deserves particular consideration. More and more Mennonites have attracted the attention of the historians and the public in the old and new world. Their imposing testimony for Christ, their extraordinary fate through four centuries, and their contribution to many fields of civilization justify the growing acknowledgment of this—numerically not too large—denomination. Its roots go back to the Left Wing Reformation of the sixteenth century. The Anabaptists, once so much in disrepute, outlived the hardship of an age of intolerance and gave proof of a living faith according to the primitive Christian pattern. In later centuries the brotherhood continued, under the purposely adopted name of Mennonites, in loyalty to their fathers' creed. Their discipline, consistency, and courage of confession in all their clashes with the "world" made them respected even by adversaries. Their story became a true epic, and should be known wherever the question of realization of the Christian life on earth is discussed. Smith's book might rightly be called the standard work on this story in our days. It is above all comprehensive, covering all centuries, all branches, and all aspects of the movement. It is packed with facts, the great ones of history as well as the smaller one of many a detail. But they all are presented in attractive narratives and graphic pictures. The author has the unusual gift of a genuine historiographer, he understands how to select his material, and knows how to make even dry facts living. There is actual life and spirit in the book, and even a sparkle of humour occurs here and there in the course of the tragic story. Of course, all these chapters are founded on extensive research. It was in 1907 that the author first started his work with his doctoral thesis on the same subject. Now, thirty-four years later, he concludes it with his mature skill and after manifold experiences in Mennonite life here and in Europe.

In two parts of about 500 and 300 pages respectively, the European and American scenes are treated. Part one deals with Anabaptism in Switzerland, South Germany, and Austria (Huterites) in the age of the Reformation, and its continuation later on. Then, the Mennonites in Holland and North Germany are depicted. This second branch has not quite the same genius as the first, yet eventually both converge in a common pattern. From Prussia, a very active group migrated to Russia in 1789, and the story of these Russian Mennonites (383-530) is particularly fascinating. A great work of agricultural construction was done in the southeastern Ukraine under the protection of special privileges.

Other groups migrated further to the East, as far as Turkestan and Siberia. With the compulsory conscription law, the World War and the Revolution, bitter days were in store for the congregations: unparalleled struggle and suffering, and in the end the grim flight of many thousands almost around the globe.

The second part tells the story of the settlements in this country, of their pioneer work and their bold persistence in defenselessness even along the dangerous frontier. In the long run it was a successful experiment. We learn not only of the external events, but also of the devotional life of these witnesses to genuine Christianity, of their literature and hymnology. One recognizes how the ideal of a consistent Christian life became a reality by means of the same discipline and simplicity which gave the brethren strength in their earlier history. These American-German Christians represented not only a denomination, but a true brotherhood with all its typical qualities. However, the march of civilization and the never before experienced political situations of today exert a most serious impact and present a trial. Will these new conditions find among the migrants the same old spirit as before? No doubt, the South American settlements face critical temptations. Yet the scene in this country has also changed to a great extent. Many young people leave the traditional farm life and join the masses of the great cities. Will they stand the test? Dr. Smith as historian remains objective; however, one feels the apprehension of the responsible leaders regarding the preservation of a heritage of such venerability.

The present book is very well made up and remarkably cheap. It should find the widest use in libraries of all kinds. There is only one regret, namely that the author designedly refrained from giving a bibliography and references to the extensive source material. He did it in view of the general reader, yet by this somewhat impaired the value of his work as a reference book.

Goshen College.

Robert Friedmann.

#### AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF EARLY NEW ENGLAND METHODISM

By GEORGE CLAUDE BAKER, JR. Durham: Duke University Press. 1941.  
145 pages. \$2.50.

Although Methodism was introduced into New England by Whitefield and Garrettson, Jesse Lee, coming at a later date, was the real father of the movement. Thus the fifty year period from 1789 to 1839 is chosen for treatment by the author. The early growth of this new "upstart" sect was rather slow owing to the opposition of the well established churches which had preempted the field. The story of this opposition and the gradual spread of the new denomination is well told. The message and the methods of Methodism are carefully weighed, its relation to the state governments, to the slavery issue, and to education and moral problems are skillfully handled. The text of the eighty-one



pages is packed with factual evidence, the bibliography of fifty-three pages is exhaustive. This is a scholarly work, profusely documented, and easily read.

The author shows that the mobility of the movement with its itinerant system was instrumental in evangelizing many of the outlying districts. The sermons sometimes bore out the claim of the Methodists that they preferred a "living" to a "learned" ministry. An excerpt from one deserves to be quoted. "What I insist upon, my brethren and sisters, is this: larnin isn't religion, and edification don't give a man the power of the spirit . . . St. Peter was a fisherman—do you think that he ever went to Yale College? Yet he was the rock upon which Christ built his church . . . When the Lord wanted to blow down the walls of Jericho, he didn't take a brass trumpet, or a polished French horn: no such thing; he took a ram's horn—a plain, natural ram's horn sort of a man like me." (14f.)

The preachers were accused of having a "nasal twang in preaching." Methodist people found themselves twitted for having "long faces, and loose, uncombed hair," while they degraded religion in worshipping in barns, schoolhouses, and by-places. But the inevitable happened, for the "sect" soon became a quite "respectable" church. Old customs like the class meeting, love feasts, protracted and camp-meetings, men and women sitting apart, were emphasized; new notions and practices were as energetically resisted. Curiously enough, the Methodists were classed with the Deists because of a common opposition to Calvinism. Methodism opposed Unitarianism, the "desolating torrent," although each supported the other in a common hostility to New England Theology. The moralistic strain as well as the futuristic hope of Universalism were considered abominations by the Wesleyan Pietists.

In harmony with all small sects, disestablishment was ardently pressed. Preaching the "simple gospel" did not seem to preclude interest in political issues. Jesse Lee, for instance, later became chaplain of the national House of Representatives. On the slavery issue the Methodists were quite consistently, though not militantly, abolitionists. Some opposition was shown to war, the War of 1812 in particular. Two prominent clergymen, however, declared for the possibility of a righteous war. On the question of temperance the sect never wavered very much during this period, one minister asserting that "drinking rum and going to hell were synonymous terms" (64).

Puritanical strictness in regard to dancing, gambling, swearing, cards, and the theatre was in harmony with the original tradition. As time marched on, it is true, education did much to modify these rigorous rules of conduct. With the growing feeling that learning and piety need not be mutually exclusive, the first Methodist college was founded in Middletown, Conn., in 1931, the Wesleyan University, with Wilbur Fiske as the first president. The first theological seminary was established in Concord, N. H. in 1847, but later transferred to Boston and is now known as Boston University School of Theology.

Garrett Biblical Institute,  
Evanston, Ill.

A. W. Nagler.

## THE ANDOVER LIBERALS, A STUDY IN AMERICAN THEOLOGY

By DANIEL DAY WILLIAMS. New York: King's Crown Press, 1941. viii, 203 pages. \$2.00.

In volume four of his *History of the Expansion of Christianity* (*The Great Century*, 415) Professor K. S. Latourette repeats what has become a commonplace of American scholarship—that “no theologian or theology of first rank issued from the nineteenth century Christianity of the United States.” Perhaps the difficulty in this generalization lies in the definition of “first rank.” But one suspects that it persists because of America’s “colonial” attitude—that it is based partly upon a nostalgic fascination with the theological genius of “the old country.” The generalization has gone unchallenged partly because of the lack of thorough historical studies of American theologians of the century. There are reasons for expecting that such studies, of which Mr. Williams’ work is an excellent example, will necessitate a drastic revision.

The first section of the book traces the movement “From Calvinism to Liberalism at Andover” in order to throw light upon the “transformation of a conservative, Calvinistic institution into a militant apostle of ‘The New Theology.’” Here perhaps Mr. Williams assumes too readily that the story of “the passing of the New England theology” has been “thoroughly told” in the studies of Frank Hugh Foster and Joseph Haroutunian. But he rightly emphasizes that revivalism was the basis of “the faith of Calvinist Orthodoxy” (7), and hence that “the ultimate standard for judging every doctrine and every practice of Christianity was thus first, Will it help or hinder the salvation of men? and second, Will it help or hinder the increase and prosperity of the church upon whose work most men are dependent for salvation?” In brief, the evangelical enterprise “was more important to these men than the particular scheme of doctrine itself,” and therefore “they were little bothered by logical difficulties in their theological position” (12). One feels that Mr. Williams did not keep this pregnant insight clearly in mind at all times during the remainder of the study. He makes clear, however, that the revivalists’ emphasis upon results led to one of the foundation principles of the later liberalism, that “religious experience is more important than doctrine” (22). This seems a more fruitful lead than the attempt sometimes made to trace that principle to obscure European sources.

After the Civil War the great problems with which theology had to deal were those raised by the impact of evolution. Evolution came to mean “connected development in any realm,” and hence to be used synonymously with “progress.” Into a static conception of Christianity was injected the idea of change and development. Theology had to wrestle with “the relativity of moral standards which centered in the concepts of evolution and progress,” with “the criticism which applied the principle of development to the origin and history of Christian

doctrine," and with "the problems involved in viewing personality as conditioned by social factors and involved in social conflicts" (31).

Very skillfully Mr. Williams traces the struggle through a willingness "to describe Christianity in language that did not so much contradict as ignore the concepts of orthodoxy" (84) to its outcome in "the faith and confusion of liberalism" (31). An optimistic belief in social progress, inevitably carrying all toward the Kingdom of God, became the content of that faith. The confusion was unavoidable at a time when new wine was being so rapidly poured into the old wine skins that they burst. But besides an optimistic faith in progress, the social gospel had another root, a recognized social need (117). Because of this it never lost a stabilizing contact with real situations, and passed from a somewhat naive defence of "economic individualism and the essentials of the existing order" (135) to sharp criticism of that order. In America Christian theology has always been close to Christian action. And as "revivalism and the missionary enterprise had been the institutional counterparts of evangelical Calvinism," so Andover's liberal Christianity found expression in Andover House, one of the many settlement houses founded during this period.

The student of American theology is handicapped by the necessity of revising completely and rejecting many of the generalizations of the past. For example, Mr. Williams has to deal with F. H. Foster's criticism that the Andover theologians were "incurably conservative" (85). He who expects to build in this area must lay his own foundations. This Mr. Williams does remarkably well. The work has two chief limitations. First, the almost exclusive attention to Andover men tends to give them an exaggerated prominence in the liberal movement. Second is the method which treats the "Andover theologians" as a unit, with the result that differences of individual viewpoint are apt to appear to be confused and illogical thinking. But all in all, the work is one of the most thorough and enlightening studies of the development of "liberalism" in America that has yet appeared.

University of Chicago.

Sidney E. Mead.

#### THE FRENCH LAIC LAWS (1879-1889)

By EVELYN M. ACOMB. New York: Columbia University Press. 1941.  
Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. 282 pages. \$3.50.

It is a very great pity that this work could not have been assured a wider public than that of the more technical historian. However, we must be thankful that in these days it has been published at all. Miss Acomb has wrestled with the problem of the cross currents of French politics caused by the Concordat and Organic Articles of 1876 together with the inability of the state, which was prepared at first to go far in the direction of concession, to control the rift in French politics. It is a sorry record of the legacy of Jesuit domination in the seventeenth

century; of the legacy of Gallicanism and the rise of papal prestige and pretension between 1814 and 1870, on the one hand, and the conflicting legacy of *l'Illumination* on the other. Miss Acomb has summed up the situation as follows (43):

"The Church's monarchist organization and the attitude of Pope Pius IX towards 'liberalism' and 'progress' offended republican sensibilities. The Declaration of Papal Infallibility in 1870 enhanced the prestige of an absolutist pope, who had sternly suppressed revolts in his own dominions. The *Syllabus of Errors*, which had been promulgated in 1864, seemed in its condemnation to negate the very principles of the French Revolution."

The natural consequence was the anti-clerical reaction, which found its expression not only in Comte's Positivism but in a mass of legislation, ordinance, and regulation which outraged the principles of freedom for which the anti-clericals professed to stand.

The chapters IV-V devoted to Education—both primary and secondary—illustrate perhaps the detail into which the struggle went, as does the account of the—sometimes petty—regulations imposed on army chaplains, confessors, teachers, and ministers (Chapter VI). The controversy on the oath (219ff.) and the alignment of parties is of particular interest. In Chapter VII the survey ends (except for the Conclusion, which sums up the findings) with the unsuccessful attack of the Religious Orders on the Concordat and the factors which limited the success of the anti-clericals. These were partly external and partly the attitude of Leo XIII, who in 1885 broke up the League of Counter-Revolution.

The real tragedy, only sketched in the concluding chapter, is the return of Ultramontanism as a result of the anti-clericals overreaching themselves, so that the situation passed from the control of the State in the years 1907-1940. Ultimately it was the impatience and intolerance of the anti-clericals that not only defeated their own ends but also effected the collapse of the State as Gambetta had already prophesied must happen—

"If old France has not a violent crisis soon, the end of the century will consecrate its fall."

Her liberals shirked the crisis and so defeated her hope of salvation.

The Graduate School of Theology,  
Oberlin College.

F. W. Buckler.

#### THE CATHOLIC MOVEMENT IN THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH

By GEORGE E. DEMILLE. Philadelphia: Church Historical Society, 1941.  
130 pages. \$2.50.

The Catholic movement in the Episcopal Church is of more than denominational interest, not only because its influence has extended beyond the denomination, but also because it illustrates the interaction

of native and European influences in American culture. A vigorous High Church revival, led by John Henry Hobart, had been started in this country three decades before the appearance of the Oxford Tracts. Though inspired by the great seventeenth century Anglican divines, it was independent of any contemporary English influence and was distinctively American in some of its aspects. The Oxford Movement, when it reached America, engulfed, rather than absorbed, this native High Churchmanship, forcing its more conservative leaders to seek refuge in a dry and lofty position which was no more Hobartian than it was Oxonian. As a result, the unity of the Anglican communion was probably strengthened, but the contact of the Episcopal Church with American life decreased.

A competent treatment of this subject on a more extended scale than is possible in a general history has long been wanted, and at last that want has been satisfactorily supplied. Mr. DeMille writes of the movement with the sympathy and understanding of an insider, but with no trace of partisanship. His book is based on extensive research, intelligently interpreted, and gives an interesting and generally accurate view of American Anglo-Catholicism and its background.

Dissent may be expressed on a few points. His judgment of Bishop Provoost is probably too severe. Though his bitter party spirit made him a disruptive influence in the church at large, Provoost worked as conscientiously as any early bishop within his diocese. His retirement was justified by poor health, and he emerged from it, not to prevent the consecration of Hobart, at which he assisted, but to stop the suspension of Hobart's enemy, Cave Jones, an act which he believed to be dictated by personal animosity. It is surprising to find the energetic and evangelical Bishop Potter of Pennsylvania described as "high and dry." A little more scepticism might have been shown toward the claim of Bishop Whittingham's biographer that his Catholicism was formulated independently of any influence from Oxford. The documentation is generally adequate, but there are a few oversights. We should like to know, for instance, the source of the epigram on Bishop White attributed to one of the Wilberforces, and of the tribute to Bishop Whittingham which is ascribed only to an "English priest." These are minor matters, however, and do not seriously detract from the general excellence of the book.

Lynbrook, N. Y.

William Wilson Manross.

SETTLEMENT OF THE BRETHREN ON THE PACIFIC SLOPE  
A STUDY IN COLONIZATION

By GLADDYS ESTHER MUIR. Elgin, Illinois: Brethren Publishing House, 1939. 469 pages. \$2.50.

The limited collection of books dealing with the history of the Protestant church on the Pacific Coast received another significant addition when this book appeared. The author has taught history for



the past twenty years in La Verne College, California—a Brethren institution. She has been well fitted by graduate study and by long association with the denomination she describes for the writing of this book. Guided by her evident desire for original source material, she has gone to old periodicals, church records, letters, and similar sources for her facts. Interviews with old-timers have given additional material. The book gives ample evidence of diligent and consistent research which covered years.

The Dunkers or the Brethren made their first settlement in Oregon in 1850. A few years later they began moving into the San Joaquin Valley in California and into the southern part of that state in 1883. The author traces out the story of these official and unofficial efforts at colonization from the beginning down to the present time. While the denomination was never numerically strong on the Pacific Coast (the estimate of the present-day population is but 11,000), yet a study of the economic and religious factors which inspired this westward movement is most significant. You have but to change the name of the denomination here studied and you get the story of what happened to other groups as they too sought to establish their homes in the Far West.

The detailed story will be of greatest value to the Brethren themselves but will be of interest to all who wish to know how the Christian Church was planted on America's last frontier.

San Anselmo, California.

Clifford M. Drury.

### THE UNITED STATES AND CIVILIZATION

By JOHN U. NEF. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. xviii, 421 pages.

"The United States, together with the other countries created by Western civilization, is at a turning-point in history, where an emphasis on material objectives for their own sake is likely to drag us into an abyss." Repeatedly Professor Nef states this text. "The United States is faced with a choice of ends. We can continue to regard it as the main objective . . . to make ourselves and the public rich in material goods. Or we can regard material wealth as a means valuable ultimately only in so far as . . . it increases the esteem in which faith, righteousness, wisdom and beauty are held by the people." The book was written before the United States entered the war, but in full view of this possibility and of "a long testing-time of struggle, suffering and disappointment."

The "turning-point" above referred to is described in the book's first division, "Civilization and the Cross Roads." There is a "Material Crisis" in Western life, brought about in recent times by "a striking reduction in industrial output relative to population." The author's standing as an economist gives authority to this discussion, and to his judgment that "in all probability the heroic period of expanding industrial output is over." There is a more serious "Moral and Intellectual Crisis." This has been brought about by a "collapse of standards," those of

"Christian humanism," which have broken down before "the encroachment of scientific methods" and the ascendancy of materialistic interests and concern for physical well-being. It is a dark picture that the author paints here, in general and in details, not all of which are convincing, of the "failure of our society during the last half-century to cultivate effectively morality, taste or intelligence." The crisis, in his view, is in that this society, spiritually impoverished, is threatened with inability to defend liberties which are spiritual in their essence, at the time of attack on them by despotisms.

In the second division, on "Ends of Civilization," a chapter on "Humanism"—the word being used in antithesis to materialism—defines as "the primary ends of man" "religion, moral philosophy and art." For these subserve "virtue, wisdom and beauty," the triad, substantially repeated many times, which expresses Professor Nef's central concern. He gives to "Religion" a long chapter, in which he ascribes the highest value to Christianity, but finds all expressions of it seriously inadequate. He is somewhat attracted to Roman Catholicism, evidently in part by his admiration for Aquinas as a fountain of "moral philosophy" and for some frequently quoted neo-Thomists, but he thinks the Roman Church in "need of a Reformation." Protestantism at present he holds in low esteem; he reports "a remarkable abandonment of articles of faith once regarded as essential to Christian belief among Protestant clergymen." In support of this alarming generalization there is offered only one piece of evidence, and this it must be said insignificant. Inadequate information here does not detract from the power of his plea for more worthy Christian churches.

"Moral Philosophy" is obviously the author's chief reliance. The phrase repeatedly occurs in his pages, and to this subject he devotes a chapter. He thinks the greatest need of our civilization is knowledge at this point. What he means he does not define more closely than "moral philosophy in the Platonic or Aristotelean sense", and what he urges is more emphasis on this in university teaching. A chapter on "Art" contains impressive appreciation of its vital relation to civilization and suggests public endowment of artists to release them from materialistic pressure.

In the last division, "Means of Approach," Professor Nef comes closer to action. A long chapter on "Education" makes proposals involving reconstruction of our whole educational organization and teaching. Some of these have been heard of before, but are none the worse for this. The changes advised are too numerous for review here. They are all dictated by the author's main concern, for "morality, intelligence, and beauty," and breathe confidence that these ends can be obtained by educational improvements. In "The Economic Structure of Society" Professor Nef lays sacrilegious hands on the dogma of "free enterprise," pronouncing this only one of several causes of Western prosperity, and indeed "less of a cause and more of a symptom." He proposes the use of public money for the endowment of private educational institutions and of churches which show themselves morally useful. This he urges more than once and evidently considers practicable and important. The obvious

objections he does not deal with. Chapters on "The Future of Democratic Government" and "The Future of International Justice" follow in the lines previously laid down.

Nobody could differ with Professor Nef's chief concern for our society, or with much of his diagnosis of its condition. His book would be more effective if it were shorter by being less repetitious. He is somewhat given to trifling illustrations and to exploiting pet antipathies. He is less strong in practical measures than in preaching his gospel, in which he has power and more power must be wished him.

Auburn Theological Seminary,  
New York City.

Robert Hastings Nichols.





JUL 6 1920

# CHURCH HISTORY

PART 2

ZDA

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY  
OF CHURCH HISTORY

*Published by*  
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY





# LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

As of June 1, 1942

*(Members are requested to inform the Secretary of any inaccuracies in this list of names and addresses).*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Adams, Arthur, Prof.<br>Trinity College<br>Hartford, Conn.             | Ariga, Tetsutaro, Prof.<br>The Doshisha<br>Kyoto, Japan.                              |
| Albaugh, Gaylord P., Rev.<br>510 E. Rosemary St.<br>Chapel Hill, N. C. | Arpee, Leon, Rev.<br>23 Morris Ave.<br>Athens, Ohio.                                  |
| Albany, James R.<br>1100 S. Goodman St.<br>Rochester, N. Y.            | Ascham, John Bayne, Dr.<br>909 Plum St.<br>Cincinnati, Ohio.                          |
| Albright, Raymond W., Prof.<br>1524 Palm Ave.<br>Reading, Penna.       | Aubrey, Edwin E., Prof.<br>Faculty Exchange<br>University of Chicago<br>Chicago, Ill. |
| Allbeck, Willard D., Prof.<br>19 E. Cecil St.<br>Springfield, Ohio     | Auer, J. A. C. Fagginger, Prof.<br>Harvard Divinity School<br>Cambridge, Mass.        |
| Amerman, Lockhart, Rev.<br>The Manse<br>Sewickley, Penna.              | Ayer, Joseph Cullen, Prof.<br>200 St. Mark's Square<br>Philadelphia, Penna.           |
| Ander, Fritiof, Prof.<br>Augustana College<br>Rock Island, Ill.        | Ayres, Samuel Gardiner, Dr.<br>71 So. Willard St.<br>Burlington, Vt.                  |
| Anderson, John L., Prof.<br>College of Idaho<br>Caldwell, Idaho.       | Azlein, Arthur A., Rev.<br>Harristown, Ill.   |
| Anderson, J. William, Prof.<br>5510 N. Sawyer Ave.<br>Chicago, Ill.    | Baillie, Charles Tupper, Dr.<br>502 W. Washington St.<br>South Bend, Ind.             |
| Anderson, O. V., Rev.<br>303 N. Spring Ave.,<br>La Grange, Ill.        | Bainton, Roland H., Prof.<br>409 Prospect St.<br>New Haven, Conn.                     |
| Arbaugh, George B., Prof.<br>Carthage College<br>Carthage, Ill.        | Bair, Lawrence E., Prof.<br>519 W. James St.<br>Lancaster, Pa.                        |

Baker, Roosevelt A., Rev.  
218 E. 57th St., Apt. 2  
Chicago, Ill.

Baron, Hans, Prof.  
5 Burbury Lane,  
Great Neck, N. Y.

Barrett, Charles Scudder  
140 Claremont Ave.  
New York, N. Y.

Batten, J. M., Prof.  
Scarritt College  
Nashville, Tenn.

Battenhouse, Roy W., Prof.  
School of Religion  
Vanderbilt University  
Nashville, Tenn.

Bauer, Walter E., Prof.  
601 Indiana Ave.  
Valparaiso, Ind.

Beardsley, Frank G., Dr.  
424 Second St. N. W.  
Minot, N. Dakota.

Beaver, R. Pierce, Dr.  
Central China Union  
Theological Seminary  
Lingling, Hunan, China

Beck, Henry G. J., Rev.  
Darlington, (Ramsey P. O.)  
New Jersey.

Bedikian, A. A., Rev.  
152 East 34th St.  
New York, N. Y.

Behney, J. Bruce, Prof.  
Bonebrake Theological Seminary  
Dayton, O.

Bella, Julius I., Rev.  
538 Grand Street  
Bridgeport, Conn.

Bender, Harold S., Dean  
Goshen College  
Goshen, Ind.

Bergendoff, C. J. I., Pres.  
Augustana College and  
Theological Seminary  
Rock Island, Ill.

Bernhardt, Harold E.  
127 South East Ave.  
Oak Park, Ill.

Beto, George J., Dean  
Concordia College  
Austin, Tex.

Billings, Bliss W., Dr.  
638 Isaac Peral  
Manila, P. I.

Binder, Louis Richard, Dr.  
Ward St. Presbyterian Church  
Paterson, N. J.

Bland, S. G., Prof.  
554 Spadina Ave.  
Toronto, Canada.

Block, Marguerite, Mrs.  
401 Low Memorial Library  
Columbia University  
New York, N. Y.

Bond, Ahva J. C., Dean  
School of Theology  
Alfred University  
Alfred, N. Y.

Bost, George H., Prof.  
853 Chalmers Place  
Chicago, Ill.

Bouquet, Francis L., Prof.  
1905 Lothrop St.  
Omaha, Nebr.

Breen, Quirinus, Prof.  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon.

Britton, Erwin A., Rev.  
35122 Main St.  
Wayne, Mich.

Bronner, Frederick L., Prof.  
Union College  
Schenectady, N. Y.

Brush, John W., Prof.  
154 Institution Ave.  
Newton Center, Mass.

Buckler, F. W., Prof.  
Graduate School of Theology  
Oberlin, O.

Buehring, Paul Henry, Prof.  
943 Frebis Ave.,  
Columbus, Ohio.

Burdick, Wm. L., Dr.  
Ashaway, R. I.

Burkhart, B. LeRoy, Prof.  
The College of the Ozarks  
Clarksville, Ark.

Cabaniss, Allen, Dr.  
Columbia  
Marion County, Miss.

Cadbury, Henry J., Prof.  
7 Buckingham Place  
Cambridge, Mass.

Calhoun, Robert L., Prof.  
Yale Divinity School  
New Haven, Conn.

Cameron, Richard M., Prof.  
Boston University School of  
Theology  
Boston, Mass.

Cardinal, Edward V., Rev.  
4200 No. Sheridan Road,  
Chicago, Ill.

Carlson, Edgar M., Prof.  
821 South 4th St.  
St. Peter, Minn.

Carlson, Leland H., Prof.  
North Park Junior College  
Foster and Kedzie  
Chicago, Illinois.

Carlson, Martin E., Rev.  
381 S. Howard St.  
Gary, Ind.

Case, Shirley Jackson, Dean  
Florida School of Religion  
Lakeland, Fla.

Chapman, Conrad, Dr.  
17—A Branch St.  
Boston, Mass.

Charanis, Peter, Prof.  
31 Lincoln Ave.,  
Highland Park, N. J.

Chase, Daryl, Dr.  
1000 N. Mountain Ave.  
Tucson, Arizona

Christie, John W., Dr.  
717 W. 32d St.  
Wilmington, Del.

Church, Frederic C., Prof.  
University of Idaho  
Moscow, Idaho

Clark, Calvin Montague, Prof.  
306 Union St.  
Bangor, Me.

Clark, Elmer T., Dr.  
150 Fifth Ave.  
New York, N. Y.

Clark, Marion E.  
1100 S. Goodman St.  
Rochester, N. Y.

Clark, William Donald  
5736 Blackstone Ave.  
Jackson Park Station  
Chicago, Ill.

Colwell, Ernest Cadman, Dean  
Faculty Exchange  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Ill.

Comin, John, Rev.  
Michigan Historical Collections  
Rackham Building  
Ann Arbor, Mich.

Correll, Ernst, Prof.  
American Univ. Graduate School  
1901 F Ave., N. W.  
Washington, D. C.

Corrigan, Raymond, Prof., S. J.  
St. Louis University  
St. Louis, Mo.

Corwin, Virginia, Prof.  
Flora Stone Mather College  
Western Reserve University  
Cleveland, O.

Cory, David M., Dr.  
360 Pacific St.  
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Cousland, K. H., Prof.  
Emmanuel College  
Toronto, Canada.

Crawford, Wm. Arrowsmith, Dr.  
First Presbyterian Church  
Monticello, N. Y.

Crusius, Paul N., Prof.  
Elmhurst College,  
Elmhurst, Ill.

Dau, Wm. H. T., Dr.  
40 Brookside  
Berkeley, Calif.

Dauerty, J. Shackelford, Dr.  
130 Chestnut St.  
Moorestown, N. J.

Davis, James M., Rev.  
270 S. Chestnut St.  
Ravenna, O.

Decker, Ruth E., Dr.  
National Training School  
15th Street and Van Brunt Blvd.  
Kansas City, Mo.

Deems, Mervin Monroe, Prof.  
331 Hammond St.  
Bangor, Me.

Dietrich, O. H., Rev.  
304 East Cedar St.  
Livingston, N. J.

Doebely, Henry Y.  
14 Blaesistrasse, Hoengg  
Zurich, Switzerland.

Drake, Thomas E., Prof.  
Haverford College  
Haverford, Pa.

Drury, Clifford M., Prof.  
118 Bolinas Ave.  
San Anselmo, Calif.

Dunn, David, Prof.  
519 Pine St.  
Lancaster, Pa.

Eckhardt, C. C., Prof.  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, Colo.

Eells, Earnest E., Captain the Rev.  
Station Hospital,  
Fort Monmouth, N. J.

Eells, Hastings, Prof.  
161 N. Liberty St.  
Delaware, O.

Egawa, J. S., Rev.  
Annaka, Gummaken, Japan

Eller, Paul H., Prof.  
Evangelical Theological Seminary  
Naperville, Ill.

Ellis, John Tracy, Prof.  
Catholic University of America  
Washington, D. C.

Evans, David J., Dr.  
First Baptist Church  
Pasadena, Calif.

Faust, Harold S., Rev.  
6155 N. Mascher St.  
Philadelphia, Pa.

Fisher, M. M., Rev.  
1219 Fayetteville St.  
Durham, N. C.

Fleming, Sandford, Pres.  
2606 Dwight Way  
Berkeley, Calif.

Folmer, Henri  
6319 Kenwood Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Forlines, C. E., Prof.  
Westminster Theological Seminary  
Westminster, Md.

Fortenbaugh, Robert, Prof.  
Gettysburg College  
Gettysburg, Penna.

Friedmann, Robert M., Dr.  
Goshen College  
Goshen, Ind.

Gaddis, Merrill E., Prof.  
Central College  
Fayette, Mo.

Gamer, Carl W., Prof.  
711 W. Main St.  
Urbana, Ill.

Garber, Paul Neff, Prof.  
Duke University  
Durham, N. C.

Garrison, W. E., Prof.  
277 Faculty Exchange  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Ill.

George, Arthur H., Prof.  
Johnson C. Smith University  
Charlotte, N. C.

Gibbs, Walter C., Prof.  
407 Walnut  
Lexington, Ky.

Gillespie, James P., Rev.  
Sound View Circle  
White Plains, N. Y.

Gingerich, Melvin, Prof.  
Bethel College  
North Newton, Kansas.

Glauner, George L., Prof.  
46 College Ave.  
Buckhannon, W. Va.

Goertz, P. S., Dean  
Bethel College  
North Newton, Kansas.

Goodenough, Erwin R., Prof.  
Hall of Graduate Studies  
Yale University  
New Haven, Conn.

Goodloe, Robert Wesley, Prof.  
Southern Methodist University  
Dallas, Texas.

Goodykoontz, Colin B., Prof.  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, Colorado.

Gray, Raymond J., Prof., S. J.  
Xavier University  
Cincinnati, Ohio

Grayzel, Solomon, Rabbi  
Gratz College  
Philadelphia, Penna.

Greene, Evarts Boutell, Dr.  
Box 194  
Croton-on-Hudson, N. Y.

Greene, John Gardner  
6 Chestnut Street  
Boston, Massachusetts.

Greene, Walter L., Prof.  
Andover, N. Y.

Griffiths, Carl Warren, Rev.  
5815 Drexel Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Grimm, Harold J., Prof.  
Ohio State University  
Columbus, O.

Griscom, Acton, Rev.  
135-35th St.  
N. Bergen, N. Y.

Guice, John A., Rev.  
7100 Main St.  
Kansas City, Mo.

Guilday, Peter, Rt. Rev. Msgr.  
Catholic University of America  
Washington, D. C.

Hall, Colby D., Dean  
Texas Christian University  
Fort Worth, Tex.

Haller, William, Prof.  
Barnard College  
Columbia University  
New York, New York



Halperin, S. W., Prof.  
Faculty Exchange  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Ill.

Hamilton, Charles G., Prof.  
St. John's Church  
Aberdeen, Miss.

Hamilton, Kenneth G., Prof.  
Bethlehem, Route 2, Penna.

Harbison, E. Harris, Prof.  
9 Aiken Ave.  
Princeton, N. J.

Hardy, E. R., Jr., Dr.  
175 Ninth Ave.  
New York, N. Y.

Harkness, R. E. E., Prof.  
Crozer Theological Seminary  
Chester, Penna.

Harmon, Nolan B., Jr., Dr.  
150 Fifth Ave.  
New York, N. Y.

Haroutunian, Joseph, Prof.  
2330 N. Halsted St.  
Chicago, Ill.

Harper, Marvin H., Prof.  
Leonard Theological College.  
Jubbulpore, C. P.  
India.

Hartwig, George H., Prof.  
Midland College  
Fremont, Nebr.

Hawkinson, Eric G., Prof.  
3225 Foster Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Hawley, Charles A., Dr.  
First Presbyterian Church,  
Atchison, Kansas.

Hays, Arthur A., Prof.  
841 Chalmers Place  
Chicago, Ill.

Heimbeck, A. Willard  
2330 N. Halsted St.  
Chicago, Ill.

Hendrickson, H. O., Prof.  
1109 Perry St.  
Albion, Mich.

Heron, Laurence T.  
18520 Stewart Ave.  
Homewood, Ill.

Hershberger, Guy F., Prof.  
Goshen College  
Goshen, Ind.

Heuss, John, Rev.  
2120 Lincoln St.  
Evanston, Ill.

Heuver, G. Austin, Rev.  
408 Kitchell Ave.,  
Pana, Ill.

Hightower, Raymond Lee, Prof.  
Kalamazoo College  
Kalamazoo, Mich.

Hildebrand, Carroll D. W., Prof.  
619 E. Washington St.  
Greencastle, Ind.

Hirsch, Elizabeth F., Dr.  
Bard College  
Annandale-on-Hudson, N. Y.

Hoffman, Milton J., Prof.  
New Brunswick Theological  
Seminary  
New Brunswick, N. J.

Holborn, Hajo, Prof.  
Yale University  
New Haven, Conn.

Holmes, J. H. A., Prof.  
King's College,  
Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Holmio, Armas K. E., Prof.  
37 Quarry St.  
Quincey, Mass.

Holter, Don W., Pres.  
Union Theological Seminary  
Manila, P. I.

Homans, Rockland T., Rev.  
86 Sixth St.  
Garden City, N. Y.

Homrighausen, Elmer G., Prof.  
Princeton Theological Seminary  
Princeton, N. J.

Honigsheim, Paul, Prof.  
217½ N. Harrison Ave.  
East Lansing, Mich.

Hooker, Richard James  
5419 University Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Hopkins, Charles Howard, Prof.  
1230 N. Yosemite St.  
Stockton, Calif.

Hough, Lynn Harold, Dean,  
Drew Theological Seminary  
Madison, N. J.

Hoyer, Theodore, Prof.  
801 DeMun Ave.  
St. Louis, Mo.

Hudson, Winthrop S., Dr.  
5935 S. Parnell  
Chicago, Illinois.

Irwin, W. A., Prof.  
5738 Blackstone Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Janes, B. Franklin, Rev.  
41 Spring St.  
Santa Cruz, Calif.

Johansmann, Urban F., Rev.  
3 East Orchard St.  
Ft. Mitchell,  
Covington, Ky.

Johnson, Elmer E. S., Prof.  
Hartford Theological Seminary  
Hartford, Conn.

Johnson, F. Ernest, Dr.  
297 Fourth Avenue  
New York, N. Y.

Johnson, Roy H., Prof.  
Thiel College  
Greenville, Penna.

Jordan, W. K., Dr.  
Faculty Exchange  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Ill.

Kegley, Charles W., Rev.  
925 Dempster St.  
Evanston, Ill.

Kelker, Stephen Marcellus, Rev.  
Christ Church  
Kent, O.

Kelso, John Mason, Rev.  
Marshallton, Del.

Kennedy, Charles J., Prof.  
713 N. Main St.  
Mt. Pleasant, Iowa.

Kerr, Hugh Thomson, Jr., Prof.  
Princeton Theological Seminary  
Princeton, N. J.

Kershner, Bruce L., Prof.  
11 Maplewood Court  
Johnson Ave.  
Indianapolis, Ind.

Kershner, Frederick D., Dean,  
College of Religion  
Butler University  
Indianapolis, Ind.

Keucher, Werner G., Rev.  
5802 Maryland Ave.,  
Chicago, Ill.

Kiessling, Elmer C., Prof.  
501 College Ave.  
Watertown, Wisc.

King, George B., Prof.  
1050 Grosvenor Ave.  
Winnipeg, Canada

Klett, Guy S.  
231 S. 44th St.  
Philadelphia, Penna.

Klingberg, Frank J., Prof.  
University of California,  
Los Angeles, Calif.

Knappen, M. M., Prof.  
Michigan State College  
East Lansing, Mich.

Knox, John, Prof.  
Faculty Exchange  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Ill.

Kohler, Paul William, Rev.  
1633 Goodman Ave.  
North College Hill, Ohio.

Krahn, Cornelius, Prof.  
Tabor College,  
Hillsboro, Kansas.

Kretzmann, Otto Paul, Pres.  
Valparaiso University  
Valparaiso, Ind.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar, Dr.  
Dept. of Philosophy  
Columbia University  
New York, N. Y.

Kromminga, D. H., Prof.  
1227 Allerton Ave., S. E.  
Grand Rapids, Mich.

Kuhne, Walter H., Rev.  
202 Colton Avenue  
Newark, N. Y.

Kuhns, Frederick I., Rev.  
5815 Drexel Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Kull, Irving S., Prof.  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, N. J.

Kuntz, Kenneth A., Rev.  
Box 52  
Amherst, O.

Langtry, Walter Dale, Rev.  
Sardis, Miss.

Latourette, Kenneth S., Prof.  
Yale Divinity School  
New Haven, Conn.

Latta, Maurice C., Prof.  
Doane College  
Crete, Nebr.

Laube, William C., Prof.  
285 N. Algona St.  
Dubuque, Iowa

Lawson, E. B., Dr.  
35 Eastwood St.  
East Orange, N. J.

Lawson, O. Gerald, Rev.  
Drew University  
Madison, N. J.

Leach, Fred H., Prof.  
1337 Tenth Ave.  
Port Huron, Mich.

Lee, John D., Jr., Prof.  
Candler School of Theology  
Emory University, Ga.

Lee, Umphrey, Pres.  
6001 Hillcrest Ave.  
Dallas, Texas.

Leiper, Henry Smith, Dr.  
297 Fourth Ave.  
New York, N. Y.

Leitch, Addison H., Prof.  
601 Spring St.  
Grove City, Penna.

Lenhart, John M., Rev., O. M. Cap.,  
St. Augustine Monastery  
220 Thirty-Seventh St.  
Arsenal Sta.  
Pittsburgh, Penna.

Lenz, Albert W., Rev.  
510 Hughes St.  
Cape May, N. J.

Leonard, Richard Day, Dr.  
Marshfield, Vt.

Lewis, Leicester C., Dr.  
Rectory of St. Martin  
in the Fields  
Chestnut Hill  
Philadelphia, Penna.

Loetscher, Frederick W., Prof.  
98 Mercer St.  
Princeton, N. J.

Loetscher, Lefferts A., Rev.  
98 Mercer St.  
Princeton, N. J.

Lowry, Charles W., Prof.  
Virginia Theological Seminary  
Alexandria, Va.

Lowther, Edgar Allan, Rev.  
Post and Mason Sts.  
San Francisco, Calif.

Ludlow, W. L., Prof.  
Muskingum College  
New Concord, O.

Lunt, William E., Prof.  
Haverford College  
Haverford, Penna.

Lyons, William N.  
6126 Woodlawn Ave.  
Apt. 104  
Chicago, Ill.

Lyttle, Charles H., Prof.  
Woodlawn & 57th St.  
Chicago, Ill.

MacArthur, Kathleen W., Prof.  
Hollins College, Va.

Macfarland, Charles S., Dr.  
Mountain Lakes, N. J.

Mackie, Alexander, Dr.  
1132 Belfield Ave.  
Drexel Hill, Del. Co., Penna.

Manross, W. W., Rev.  
8 Garfield Place  
Lynbrook, N. Y.

Manz, Karl George, Rev.  
609 E. 16th.  
Austin, Texas

Martin, Hubert K., Prof.  
Atlantic Union College  
South Lancaster, Mass.

Marts, Arnaud C., Pres.  
Bucknell University  
Lewisburg, Penna.

Mather, Thomas Bradley, Rev.  
7434 Madison  
Kansas City, Mo.

McCammon, Sidney Case, Rev.  
The Community Church  
Mariemont  
Cincinnati, O.

McEldowney, James E., Rev.  
5617 Drexel Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

McGiffert, Arthur C., Jr., Pres.  
Pacific School of Religion  
Berkeley, Calif.

McGowan, John P., C. M., Prof.  
Mary Immaculate Seminary  
Northampton, Penna.

McKinney, William W., Dr.  
823 Maplewood Ave.  
Ambridge, Penna.

McMahon, Thomas J., Prof.  
St. Joseph's Seminary  
Dunwoodie, Yonkers, N. Y.

McNeil, Harold O., Rev.  
76 S. Village Ave.  
Rockville Center, L. I., N. Y.

McNeill, John T., Prof.  
University of Chicago,  
Chicago, Ill.

Mead, Sidney E., Dr.  
Faculty Exchange  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Ill.

Michaelides, George P., Prof.  
5115 Fowler Ave.  
Cleveland, O.

Miller, Herschel G., Rev.  
2017 St. Paul St.  
Baltimore, Md.

Miller, Wallace E., Dr.  
Route 1  
Springfield, O.

Moehlman, Conrad Henry, Prof.  
229 Avondale Rd.  
Rochester, N. Y.

Moffatt, James, Prof.  
3041 Broadway  
New York, N. Y.

Moore, Dale H., Pres.  
Cedar Crest College  
Allentown, Pa.

Moose, John B., Prof.  
1107 Duke Avenue  
Columbia, S. C.

Morrison, Paul G., Dr.  
6136 Greenwood Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Morse, James K., Rev.  
48 Fairmount Ave.  
Hackensack, N. J.

Mott, John R., Dr.  
156 Fifth Ave.  
New York, N. Y.

Mueller, William A., Prof.  
5036 Smithfield Rd.  
Drexel Hill, Penna.

Muller, James A., Prof.  
4 St. John's Rd.  
Cambridge, Mass.

Mullett, Charles F., Prof.  
University of Missouri  
Columbia, Mo.

Nagler, Arthur Wilford, Prof.  
Garrett Biblical Institute  
Evanston, Ill.

Neeld, George Avery, Rev.  
50 Granada Terrace  
New London, Conn.

Nef, John U., Prof.  
Faculty Exchange  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Ill.

Newcombe, A. W., Prof.  
Knox College  
Galesburg, Ill.

Nichols, James Hastings, Prof.  
1852 Lincoln Ave.  
St. Paul, Minn.

Nichols, Robert Hastings, Prof.  
99 Claremont Ave.  
New York, N. Y.

Nickels, Horace J., Prof.  
School of Religion  
Howard University  
Washington, D. C.

Noffsinger, Jack R.  
1100 S. Goodman St.  
Rochester, N. Y.

Norwood, Frederick A., Prof.  
1511 S. Baltimore  
Tulsa, Okla.

Norwood, Percy V., Prof.  
600 Haven St.  
Evanston, Ill.

Nyholm, Paul C. E., Prof.  
Trinity Theological Seminary  
Blair, Nebr.

Oborn, George T., Prof.  
Taylor University  
Upland, Ind.

Odell, Morgan, Prof.  
1906 Escampa Drive  
Los Angeles, Calif.

Odložilik, O., Prof.  
1234 John Jay Hall  
Columbia University  
New York, N. Y.

Oliphant, J. Orin, Prof.  
302 S. Third St.  
Lewisburg, Penna.

Outler, Albert C., Prof.  
Duke University  
Durham, N. C.

Owen, William H., Dr.  
88 Morningside Drive  
New York City.

Parsons, Ernest W., Prof.  
Colgate-Rochester Divinity School  
Rochester, N. Y.

Parvis, Merrill M., Rev.  
6126 Woodlawn Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Pauck, Wilhelm, Prof.  
5757 University Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Pears, Thomas Clinton, Jr., Dr.  
520 Witherspoon Bldg.  
Philadelphia, Penna.

Peck, George T., Rev.  
1326 E. Fifty-seventh St.  
Chicago, Ill.

Pennington, Edgar L., Rev.  
U. S. Naval Air Station  
Jacksonville, Fla.

Perkins, Haven P., Rev.  
467 W. Jackson St.  
Woodstock, Ill.

Persons, Frederick T., Rev.  
14 Beacon St.  
Boston, Mass.

Peterson, Vivan A., Dr.  
2275 Tudor Drive  
Cleveland, O.

Petry, Ray C., Prof.  
128 Pinecrest Rd.  
Durham, N. C.

Piepkorn, A. C., Captain the Rev.  
Sixth Division  
Fort Snelling, Minn.

Pierce, Richard D., Rev.  
157 Institution Ave.  
Newton Centre, Mass.

Piper, Otto A., Prof.  
58 Mercer St.  
Princeton, N. J.

Pletz, John C., Prof.  
Faculty Exchange  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Ill.

Pratt, D. Butler, Dr.  
1245 Crittendon St. N. W.  
Washington, D. C.

Qualben, L. P., Prof.  
24 Homestead Ave.  
Port Richmond, L. I., N. Y.

Ramaker, Albert J., Prof.  
147 Chelmsford Road  
Brighton Station, Rochester, N. Y.

Randolph, Corliss F.  
83 Jefferson Ave.  
Maplewood, N. J.

Reed, Luther D., Pres.  
Lutheran Theological Seminary  
Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Penna.

Reid, W. Stanford, Prof.  
2330 De Lorimier Ave.  
Montreal, P. Q., Canada.

Repp, Arthur C., Rev.  
3107 Buena Vista St.  
San Antonio, Tex.

Reu, M., Prof.  
445 Wartburg Place  
Dubuque, Iowa.

Reynolds, W. R., Prof.  
Asbury College  
Wilmore, Ky.

Richardson, Cyril C., Prof.  
99 Claremont Ave.  
New York, N. Y.

Riegler, Gordon A., Rev.  
4810 Winton Rd.  
Cincinnati, Ohio

Rigg, H. A., Jr., Prof.  
Western Reserve University  
Cleveland, Ohio

Riley, Arthur J., Prof.  
St. John's Seminary  
Brighton, Mass.



Rist, Martin, Prof.  
Iliff School of Theology  
Denver, Colo.

Roberts, W. H., Prof.  
163 Oak Street  
Hillsdale, Mich.

Rockwell, Katharine L. R., Dr.  
606 W. 122nd St.  
New York, N. Y.

Rockwell, William Walker, Dr.  
3041 Broadway  
New York, N. Y.

Rogers, Elizabeth F., Prof.  
Wilson College,  
Chambersburg, Penna.

Ross, W. Gordon, Prof.  
Berea College  
Berea, Ky.

Roth, Paul H., Prof.  
Northwestern Lutheran  
Theological Seminary  
Minneapolis, Minn.

Sandlin, James L., Rev.  
First Christian Church  
Clarksdale, Miss.

Satre, W. Carl, Rev.  
Box 503  
Lena, Ill.

Schaeffer, Charles E., Dr.  
1505 Race St.  
Philadelphia, Penna.

Schaeffer, Henry, Prof.  
1606 South Eleventh Ave.  
Maywood, Ill.

Schermerhorn, W. D., Prof.  
Garrett Biblical Institute  
Evanston, Ill.

Schilling, Frederick A., Rev.  
St. Paul's Rectory  
Kennewick, Wash.

Schneider, Carl E., Prof.  
Eden Theological Seminary  
Webster Groves, Mo.

Schneider, Herbert W., Prof.  
Philosophy Hall  
Columbia University  
New York, N. Y.

Schrag, Felix J.  
9407 S. 51st Ave.  
Oak Lawn, Ill.

Schwab, Paul J., Prof.  
Trinity University  
Waxahachie, Tex.

Schwarze, Wm. Nathaniel, Pres.  
Moravian Theological Seminary  
Bethlehem, Penna.

Schwiebert, Ernest G., Prof.  
Valparaiso University  
Valparaiso, Ind.

Seesholtz, Anne G., Dr.  
2500 W. North Ave.  
Baltimore, Md.

Seltzer, George R., Prof.  
7300 Boyer St.  
Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Penna.

Shaffer, Frank L., Rev.  
Grace Church  
Defiance, Ohio.

Shaw, Plato E., Dr.  
420 W. 118th St.  
New York, N. Y.

Shepherd, Massey H., Jr., Dr.  
99 Brattle St.  
Cambridge, Mass.

Shewmaker, William O., Dr.  
1750 Forrest Ave.  
Memphis, Tenn.

Shires, Henry M., Prof.  
2451 Ridge Road  
Berkeley, Cal.

Simcox, Carroll Eugene, Rev.  
St. Paul's Episcopal Church  
Owatonna, Minn.

Simms, Benjamin J.  
The Quadrangle,  
Oberlin College,  
Oberlin, Ohio.

Slosser, Gaius J., Prof.  
203 Summit Ave.  
Bellevue  
Pittsburgh, Penna.

Smith, A. Marguerite, Miss  
Zion Research Library  
120 Seaver Street  
Brookline, Massachusetts.

Smith, C. Henry, Prof.  
Bluffton College  
Bluffton, Ohio.

Smith, H. Shelton, Prof.  
1523 Hermitage Court  
Durham, N. C.

Snuggs, R. Grady, Prof.  
1748 South Knoxville,  
Tulsa, Okla.

Sonne, Niels H., Dr.  
25 Greenwood Ave.  
Madison, N. J.

Spinka, Matthew, Prof.  
5757 University Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Stacey, Alexander, Dr.  
Rhinebeck, N. Y.

Stafford, G. W., Prof.  
57 Madison Ave.  
Madison, N. J.

Starr, Edward C.  
Colgate University  
Hamilton, N. Y.

Stearns, Raymond P., Prof.  
202 W. Vermont Avenue  
Urbana, Ill.

Stiansen, Peder, Prof.  
3040 W. Washington Blvd.  
Station D  
Chicago, Ill.

Stockwell, B. Foster, Pres.  
Rivadavia 6100,  
Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Stoudt, John Joseph, Rev.  
1054 Tilghman St.  
Allentown, Penna.

Stowe, Walter M., Dr.  
184 College Ave.  
New Brunswick, N. J.

Stratemeier, K. J., Dr.  
1876 Delhi St.  
Dubuque, Ia.

Stuckey, Melvin A., Prof.  
Ashland Theological Seminary,  
Ashland, Ohio.

Sweet, William W., Prof.  
Box 37, Faculty Exchange  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, Ill.

Swift, David E.  
20 South 12th St.  
Philadelphia, Penna.

Sword, Victor Hugo, Dr.  
Gauhati  
Assam, India.

Talbert, C. A., Prof.  
Gammon Theological Seminary  
Atlanta, Ga.

Tappert, Theodore G., Dr.  
7333 Germantown Ave.  
Philadelphia, Penna.

Teener, James W., Prof.  
Park College  
Parkville, Mo.

Thompson, Donald A.  
1309 L Street, N. W.,  
Washington D. C.

Thompson, Ernest Trice, Prof.  
Union Theological Seminary  
Richmond, Va.

Thrift, Charles T., Prof.  
Florida School of Religion  
Lakeland, Fla.

Tilleux, Eugene A., Dr.  
Suite A-30  
Washington Auditorium  
Washington, D. C.

Titus, Eric L.  
5529 Kenwood Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Toth, Wm., Rev.  
2621 N. Second St.  
Harrisburg, Pa.

Townsend, William T., Dr.  
53 Felsmore Ave.  
Pawtucket, R. I.

Trost, Theodore L., Prof.  
91 Commonwealth Drive  
Brighton Station  
Rochester, N. Y.

Troxel, Daniel C., Prof.  
College of the Bible  
Lexington, Ky.

Tryon, Harold Harrison, Prof.  
3041 Broadway  
New York, N. Y.

Tucker, Robert Leonard, Rev.  
Indianola M. E. Church  
Columbus, O.

VanderVelde, Lewis G., Prof.  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Mich.

Varg, Paul A.  
3406 Foster Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Versteeg, John M., Dr.  
2409 Upland Place  
Cincinnati, O.

Von Rohr, John R., Rev.  
102 New Haven Ave.  
Woodmont, Conn.

Walker, Dean E., Prof.  
School of Religion  
Butler University  
Indianapolis, Indiana.

Walzer, William C., Rev.  
5800 Maryland Ave.  
Chicago, Ill.

Warburton, Stacy R., Prof.  
2606 Dwight Way  
Berkeley, Calif.

Washburn, Henry B., Dean  
3 Mason St.  
Cambridge, Mass.

Weigle, Luther A., Dean  
409 Prospect St.,  
New Haven, Conn.

Weis, Frederick L.  
Lancaster, Mass.

Weng, Armin G., Dr.  
800 S. Clifton Ave.  
Park Ridge, Ill.

Wenger, John C., Prof.  
Goshen College  
Goshen, Ind.

Wentz, Abdel Ross, Pres.  
Lutheran Theological Seminary  
Gettysburg, Penna.

Wernecke, Herbert H., Prof.  
518 Lake Ave.  
Webster Groves, Mo.

Weswig, Carl M., Prof.  
1456 Branston St.  
St. Paul, Minn.

Whidden, Evan MacDonald, Prof.  
Acadia University  
Wolfville, N. S., Canada

## MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

177

Whitmyre, James H., Rev.  
22 N. Germantown Rd.  
Chattanooga, Tenn.

Wilbur, Earl M., Dr.  
21 Mosswood Rd.  
Berkeley, Calif.

Wittke, Carl F., Dean  
Oberlin College  
Oberlin, O.

Wolf, Richard C., Rev.  
111 Market St.  
Bloomsburg, Penna.

Woolley, Paul, Prof.  
Westminster Theological Seminary  
Chestnut Hill  
Philadelphia, Penna.

Yergin, Howard V., Rev.  
156 Fifth Avenue  
New York, N. Y.

Yost, Frank H., Prof.  
Seventh-Day Adventist Theo. Sem-  
inary  
Takoma Park  
Washington, D. C.

Zabriskie, Alexander C., Prof.  
Virginia Theological Seminary  
Alexandria, Va.

Zachariades, George E., Dr.  
43 Wachusett St.  
Worcester, Mass.

Zema, Demetrius B., S. J., Prof.  
Fordham University  
Bronx, New York, N. Y.

Zorbaugh, Charles L., Dr.  
1877 Windermere St.  
East Cleveland, O.